

NEW YORK.

Pryce W. Bailey to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, in the county of Seneca and State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Barnabas A. Baber to be postmaster at Shelby, in the county of Cleveland and State of North Carolina.

OHIO.

Samuel N. Patton to be postmaster at Hillsboro, in the county of Highland and State of Ohio.

William D. Powley to be postmaster at Monroeville, in the county of Huron and State of Ohio.

Charles J. Thompson to be postmaster at Defiance, in the county of Defiance and State of Ohio.

TENNESSEE.

Frank W. Galbraith to be postmaster at Jefferson City, in the county of Jefferson and State of Tennessee.

N. J. Tallent to be postmaster at Dayton, in the county of Rhea and State of Tennessee.

William J. Wells to be postmaster at Loudon, in the county of Loudon and State of Tennessee.

WASHINGTON.

Hiram Hammer to be postmaster at Sedro Woolley, in the county of Skagit and State of Washington.

Charles P. Kimball to be postmaster at Bremerton, in the county of Kitsap and State of Washington.

Daniel C. Pearson to be postmaster at Stanwood, in the county of Snohomish and State of Washington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 10, 1906.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 7, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT.

The SPEAKER appointed Representative BRADLEY of New York, a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. DRESSER was given leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, under the rules this is District day. I understand that there is an appropriation bill before the House which it especially desires to act upon, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to call up business reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia next Monday instead of to-day.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I understand next Monday will be suspension day. I do not think that a special order ought to be made for that day.

Mr. BABCOCK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest next Tuesday.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that I should be present on District day, and I shall be obliged to be absent on Tuesday. I shall therefore object.

Mr. BABCOCK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will change my request and ask that it be in order to call up business reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia on the day following the conclusion of the appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SENATE BILL AND RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title and the following resolution were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below: Senate concurrent resolution 25:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3454) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to William Wilson."

to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

An act (S. 6261) to establish a fund for public works in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. LATTA, one of his secretaries.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the reprint of the bill (H. R. 9754) to provide for the classification of the salaries of clerks employed in post-offices of the first and second classes.

The request was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21574) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes, and pending that I desire to ask the other side of the House if we can agree upon any time for general debate?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I suggest to my colleague on the committee that debate can run on a while until we can ascertain later in the day how much time we want on either side.

Mr. BINGHAM. Could we not agree on two days for general debate?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am inclined to think that we do not want as much as two days.

Mr. BINGHAM. Very well; then at present we will allow the debate to run without limit.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] in charge of the bill will necessarily be absent to-morrow, and if general debate should close before that time, it ought to be understood that the bill should not be taken up under the five-minute rule Wednesday.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will agree to that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that if general debate should close before the adjournment on Tuesday, the bill shall not be called for reading under the five-minute rule until Wednesday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the question of division of time has been agreed upon. I do not know whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Georgia desire to make any agreement about it.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time for general debate be equally divided between the two sides of the House, the time to be controlled on the other side by the gentleman from Georgia and on this side by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or such Members, as they may designate in their absence. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion of Mr. BINGHAM was then agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. HERBURN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, my remarks in presenting this bill for the consideration of your committee will be most limited so far as the details of the bill are concerned. The current law, which this House made at its first session, was so fully and ably discussed that this body—the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union—is perhaps as familiar with it as any explanation I could make, and I shall advert to it only in this respect, that the current law was presented to the House on March 9 and to the Committee of the Whole House on March 13, and passed the House on March 24. If my recollection of the reading be correct, there was but one important change in the bill as presented by the committee. The bill, therefore, as it came from the committee—that is, the complete examination covering some seven hundred and fifty-odd pages of testimony, consuming a number of days in the hearing of that testimony—was so thorough and complete that upon the presentation of the details the House accepted the action of your committee. That law has operated during this fiscal year and has resulted in much good administration in the legislative, the executive, and the judicial departments of the Government.

This bill, as has been common for some ten years past, comes from your committee after having assembled—the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations—on the 26th day of November last. Beginning with that date and continuing from day to day the deliberations of the committee, they will be found to occupy some 300 pages of printed testimony, and they are respectfully submitted to the House in detail. Your Book of Estimates was critically gone through, and I think a wise conclusion reached. The committee, sitting, as I have stated, before the usual assembling of the House, followed a practice which has been common for the past ten years and more. Therefore there is nothing unusual in presenting this legislation to the House at this early date. The rulings of the Chair with reference to the many points of order, together with the report from the Committee on Rules which passed the House by a vote of 169 yeas to 109 nays, had been adopted and followed, and the bill passed upon under those rulings in their qualifications may present the same propositions in this House. This bill is built upon the same lines as the bill that you acted upon in the first session. It is open to the same character of points of order, and I am free to say that, so far as I am concerned, the ruling of the Chair was clear, and may be quoted in this debate at some period during the details of the bill. There will be no time lost in taking exception to the ruling, because it is a clear ruling, so far as this bill is concerned. We have endeavored in presenting the legislation that is before you to make the bill economic in relation to the current-year appropriations, as well as careful with reference to the estimates submitted by the several Departments of the Government.

The estimates on which the bill is based will be found on pages 9-95 and 140-151 of the Book of Estimates for 1908, and aggregate \$31,215,525.80, of which amount there is recommended in the bill \$30,529,853.80, a reduction of \$685,652 under said estimates. Your committee are of the opinion that in submitting that conclusion we have been neither neglectful of the requirements of the several Departments and their needs, nor have we been forgetful of the merits of some limited number of the subordinate force who are recommended for increase in salary. The appropriations for the same purposes for the current fiscal year, including \$448,066 carried in the sundry civil, deficiency, and other acts, aggregate \$30,168,485.30, being \$361,368.50 less than is recommended in the accompanying bill for the service of the fiscal year 1908. The whole number of salaries specifically provided for in the bill is 14,727, or 202 less than the number estimated for and 29 more than the number provided for in the law for the current year.

I shall not at this time select from the report such parts of the proposed changes as I think may commend themselves perhaps to the criticism or approval of the committee, but at a later stage, when we reach the paragraphs of the bill, I may do so.

The Government Printing Office, acting under the authority of the current law, has submitted to us in detail such force as can hereafter be placed in this bill at a fixed compensation. The Library of Congress we have left almost as it is in the current law, and in that connection at this time permit me to suggest that the great part of this bill is current law. As to the Department of State, I shall advert to it in my remarks by quoting some of the statements of the Secretary. We have been generous to that Department in this bill, as has been the current law. In the Treasury Department, with its upward of 3,000 subordinates, there are a limited number of changes. The same may be said of the War Department. There is a limited changes in respect to the office of public buildings and grounds, and there are some changes in the matter of the State, War, and Navy building, where also there has been a reduction of force—a change in the heating apparatus of the building. The Navy Department is most limited in the changes we have made, as is also the Department of the Interior, one of the great Departments of the Government. I may say the same of the Post-Office Department, with its great growth, and of the Department of Justice, as well as the Department of Commerce and Labor, and also the Court of Claims.

I will place in my remarks for the information of the House and its convenience a full report that goes into detail of the several paragraphs of increases or changes in the bill. Gentlemen will find on page 23 of the bill now before the House the first limitation, or submission, as it may be called, of new law:

Hereafter in printing documents authorized by law or ordered by Congress or either branch thereof the Government Printing Office shall follow the rules of orthography established by Webster's or other generally accepted dictionaries of the English language.

The Congress has been now in session a week, and the question of simplified spelling has been one of general discussion. I believe the list embraces 300 words. It is not my purpose to enter into a debate which will undoubtedly be entered into

by gentlemen of the House, but the matter came before your subcommittee on Appropriations naturally. The Book of Estimates contained the simplified spelling. Throughout all the items submitted in the book were appropriations recommended in that way. The print coming from the Public Printer came to us with the simplified spelling. In that way it came to our attention. The matter was discussed in committee. The Public Printer was called, together with his proof reader and his chief of printing. We heard them, and I shall make as part of my remarks all of the testimony before the subcommittee that pertains to simplified spelling. The bill before you, printed by order of the House and for its use, is printed in the old form or style of orthography. There has been current a rumor in newspapers that the Supreme Court by some dicta or utterance has declared that these and other matters should be printed in the old form. I can state to the House there has been no such official declaration. It would seem that the Solicitor-General of the United States recently, in submitting to the court a brief, had his attention called to it by the Chief Justice, who stated that in quoting to the court any authority the use of simplified spelling was not a literal quotation. That, I believe, is all the Supreme Court has uttered upon the subject of simplified or old-style spelling. The printing of the Supreme Court continues to be done according to the old style of spelling, the court having given no instructions to use the simplified form. I think that will cover all that I desire to say at this time with reference to simplified spelling.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I wondered what gave this matter such gravity and importance as to justify Congress to enact a law fixing the style of orthography. Is there any economy or other reason—

Mr. BINGHAM. I believe if the gentleman will hold his inquiry in abeyance until he reads what I may have to say in tomorrow's Record he will get the whole discussion in the committee with the Public Printer, together with his proof reader and chief of printing, which exhibits exactly, as near as we can reach, what the addition of expense will be. As to complications, perhaps we would not have them in the House in the matter of spelling, as they would in quotations before the Supreme Court, but I have simply called attention to the proposed action in order that, as debate will perhaps continue for several days, the whole subject might be gone into, illuminated, if it is possible, by the report we have to submit from the Public Printer. There is nothing, I may say further, beyond a general discussion in print, as well as conversations of men, especially here, that one print directed by the Congress for the printing of a bill would be in one form and the print submitted by the Treasury Department in the estimates in another form. We want, so far as the legislative branch of the Government is concerned, that there should be a consistency in our printing.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, unless there be something above the mere establishment of uniformity I do not think Congress ought to enact any legislation on the question at all, because the standard of spelling is virtually of usage, and spelling is improving all the time. There is a gradual evolution in spelling words in the English language. I think there ought to be. I think I may be satisfied when I read the gentleman's speech.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is one matter which will come up very early when you reach the bill, and it might be well to refer to it at this time.

On page 21 of the printed bill, and I advert to it early in order that it may form part of the early debate, because it comes very early in the consideration of the bill, is the following paragraph:

For clerk hire, Members and Delegates: To pay each Member and Delegate for clerk hire necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$1,500 per annum, in monthly installments, \$594,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled to payment under this appropriation.

For the information of the House I have been requested to repeat the amount, namely, \$1,500, in lieu of the present law of \$1,200. I would submit that in the Senate there is one committee—

Mr. KEIFER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER]?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. KEIFER. Before leaving that point I want to ask the gentleman to state to the House what distinction there is in the

matter of drawing the salary of a clerk under the old law and under the proposed law?

Mr. BINGHAM. Under the old law it is limited to \$100 per month, with a certification that the amount has been expended during that month. This puts the sum total of \$1,500 unqualifiedly under the control of the Member, with only this qualification, that the clerk has necessarily been employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, further—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. KEIFER. Then we know, do we not, that there is no certificate required to be made at all by the Member as a condition of his drawing the \$1,500?

Mr. BINGHAM. I understand that the \$1,500 is in his absolute control, to be expended during the year, without regard to the month.

Mr. KEIFER. Does it not look like it is adding \$1,500 to the salary of each Member?

Mr. BINGHAM. I can not answer the question. The House can do that.

Mr. McCALL. Would it not be necessary to certify that the clerk was necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his duties?

Mr. BINGHAM. Without a doubt.

Mr. KEIFER. I say there is no provision for a certificate to be required at all. It does put some little moral obligation upon the Member that he necessarily expend it, but that does not hurt anything.

Mr. McCALL. It seems to me there should be a certificate to comply with the law.

Mr. KEIFER. None whatever is provided for.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have made the statement just as the law reads to the House. When it comes up we can make such qualifications as we desire.

For the information of the House I will state that in the Senate there is one committee having a clerk at \$3,000; one committee having a clerk at \$2,500; forty committees having clerks at \$2,220; two committees having clerks at \$2,100; twenty-one committees having clerks at \$1,800; making sixty-five committees of the Senate having annual clerks. The chairmen of these committees have no other allowance for clerk hire. Twenty-five Senators who are not chairmen of committees are entitled to one clerk each, at \$1,800. These Senators have no other allowances for clerk hire. In the House there are two clerks of committees receiving \$3,000 each; thirty-two committees having clerks at \$2,000 each; ten committees having clerks at \$6 per day each during the session. All of the 392 Members and Delegates are entitled to an allowance at the rate of \$1,200 each per annum for clerk hire during the recess of Congress, and all of the Members and Delegates except those who are chairmen of a committee having clerks at \$6 per day are entitled to the allowance of \$1,200 per annum for clerk hire all the year round. The chairmen of committees having clerks at \$6 per day during the session receive no other allowance for clerk hire during the session.

I have no other general statement to make at this time. As debate progresses and criticism of the bill runs I may feel it necessary, as other members of the committee may, to defend the provisions of the bill.

I emphasize the statement that this bill in its build-up is consistent with the current law. The Book of Estimates for next year has been investigated by the same subcommittee that considered the estimates for the current fiscal year, and has been acted upon by the same general committee. I hope and believe that this House can find it in its power, in view of the presentation of this bill in its many qualifications, that there can be consummated after the reading of the bill the passage of the same, as has heretofore occurred, in one day, several times in two days.

The following is from the hearings before the Appropriations Committee:

SIMPLIFIED SPELLING.

Mr. LITTAUER. We find in the next paragraph the word "catalog," and below the word "cataloguer," and we would like to know why you have changed the orthography of the documents that you have sent here?

Mr. BINGHAM. Is there any statute that gives the President authority in any way to change the spelling—have you looked into that?

Mr. STILLINGS. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then, if a Department should want to change the spelling from what is known as the normal or usual spelling, you would accept the order?

Mr. STILLINGS. Under the order of the President the Departments were ordered to have spelling done that way, and would naturally have to obey the order.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is nothing in the statute that authorizes him to give that order, either for or against that proposition?

Mr. STILLINGS. I do not know as to that.

Mr. BINGHAM. Why did you, then, print these bills under that special spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. I do not know why it should have been done in this case.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is not the Book of Estimates printed in the same manner?

Mr. STILLINGS. The Book of Estimates emanates from the Treasury Department and is printed at the Treasury branch. An effort has been made to carry out the President's order in reference to simplified spelling.

Mr. TAWNEY. The Book of Estimates is printed at the Treasury branch?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. This bill is printed in your office?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. In printing this bill, then, your employees must have followed the spelling contained in the Book of Estimates?

Mr. STILLINGS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TAWNEY. And that is how it came about?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir; if this was copied from a departmental document which was prepared on the simplified spelling lines.

Mr. TAWNEY. What was the President's order, and have you a copy of it?

Mr. STILLINGS. I have not a copy here.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will you kindly furnish a copy of the order and have it appear in connection with your testimony?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
Oyster Bay, N. Y., August 27, 1906.

MY DEAR MR. STILLINGS: I inclose herewith copies of certain circulars of the Simplified Spelling Board, which can be obtained free from the board at No. 1 Madison avenue, New York City. Please hereafter direct that in all Government publications of the Executive Departments the 300 words enumerated in circular No. 5 shall be spelled as therein set forth. If anyone asks the reason for the action, refer him to circulars 3, 4, and 6, as issued by the Simplified Spelling Board. Most of the criticism of the proposed step is evidently made in entire ignorance of what the step is, no less than in entire ignorance of the very moderate and common-sense views as to the purposes to be achieved, which views are so excellently set forth in the circulars to which I have referred. There is not the slightest intention to do anything revolutionary or initiate any far-reaching policy. The purpose simply is for the Government, instead of lagging behind popular sentiment, to advance abreast of it and at the same time abreast of the views of the ablest and most practical educators of our time, as well as of the most profound scholars—men of the stamp of Professor Lounsbury and Professor Skeat.

If the slight changes in the spelling of the 300 words proposed wholly or partially meet popular approval, then the changes will become permanent without any reference to what public officials or individual private citizens may feel; if they do not ultimately meet with popular approval they will be dropped, and that is all there is about it. They represent nothing in the world but a very slight extension of the unconscious movement which has made agricultural implement makers and farmers write "plow" instead of "plough," which has made most Americans write "honor" without the somewhat absurd, superfluous "u;" and which is even now making people write "program" without the "me"—just as all people who speak English now write "bat," "set," "dim," "sum," and "fish," instead of the Elizabethan "batte," "sette," "dimme," "summe," and "fyshe;" which makes us write "public," "almanac," "era," "fantasy," and "wagon" instead of the "publick," "almanack," "aera," "phantasy," and "waggon" of our great-grandfathers. It is not an attack on the language of Shakespeare and Milton, because it is in some instances a going back to the forms they used, and in others merely the extension of changes which, as regards other words, have taken place since their time. It is not an attempt to do anything far-reaching or sudden or violent; or indeed anything very great at all. It is merely an attempt to cast what slight weight can properly be cast on the side of the popular forces which are endeavoring to make our spelling a little less foolish and fantastic.

Sincerely, yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

HON. CHARLES A. STILLINGS,
Public Printer, Washington.

Mr. TAWNEY. Was there any reference in the order to the report of a board on simplified spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. I was referred to the report of a board on simplified spelling.

Mr. BINGHAM. How many words does the new spelling book contain?

Mr. STILLINGS. Three hundred.

Mr. TAWNEY. Three hundred words the spelling of which was changed by the report of this board?

Mr. STILLINGS. No, sir; many of the 300 words in this were already in preferred use.

Mr. TAWNEY. In looking over the names of the men constituting this board I notice Mr. Isaac K. Funk, editor and publisher of the Standard Dictionary. In the event that Congress adopted the simplified spelling by having Congressional documents and laws printed in accordance with the report of this board, would it be necessary to get out a new dictionary?

Mr. STILLINGS. I think it would ultimately; yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. I notice, also, the names of Mr. Charles P. G. Scott, etymological editor of the Century Dictionary; Mr. E. O. Vaile, of Chicago. Do you know what business he is engaged in?

Mr. STILLINGS. No, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. I also notice the names of Mr. Benjamin E. Smith, editor of the Century Dictionary, New York, and Henry Holt, a publisher of New York. Is that a school-book publishing house?

Mr. STILLINGS. I understand it to be.

Mr. TAWNEY. The adoption by Congress of this form of spelling would ultimately, and in the very near future, no doubt, necessitate the publication of a new dictionary and new school books and their purchase by the citizens of the United States?

Mr. STILLINGS. That would probably be the result.

Mr. LITTAUER. It was a mistake, according to your opinion, to print this bill in this manner?

Mr. STILLINGS. Certainly; Congressional printing was not contemplated in the President's order.

Mr. BINGHAM. As matters now stand with reference to spelling, suppose Congress directs the publication or the issuance of a thousand copies of a report, a publication from one of the Departments, what spelling would you adopt?

Mr. STILLINGS. We should follow the usual style.
Mr. BINGHAM. So that the general publications of the Government without any act of Congress or any movement on the part of the Executive would be printed in the old spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. Where the order comes from Congress we have no authority to change the spelling.

Mr. LITTAUER. Let us get at the effect of this order on your work. In the first place, we will say that a Department sends you copy and it is in the new spelling. You then simply set up the type in accordance with that order, do you not?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LITTAUER. If it were a document that would require submission to Congress and Congress should declare that all documents coming to Congress should be in the usual spelling, would it require the resetting of the type?

Mr. STILLINGS. It would require the correcting of that portion of the standing type or plate wherein the changes had to be made.

Mr. LITTAUER. On each page or on every two or three pages?

Mr. STILLINGS. Possibly once every two pages.

Mr. LITTAUER. And if it was set up on a linotype machine?

Mr. STILLINGS. We would have to cast a new slug.

Mr. TAWNEY. What, in your judgment, approximately, would be the additional expense of those changes?

Mr. STILLINGS. That is something I do not know, because we have never had an occasion to try it out. Here is the point that must be thought out: The bulk of our documents are printed from plates.

Mr. LITTAUER. Could the plates be changed?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir; if you are going to change from the simplified to the usual spelling, you would make the changes on the plate in most cases. How much of it would be done is very difficult to estimate. The foreman of our proof division, from his experience in handling copy, seems to feel that it would not be so radical a change as appears on the surface. Of course you can see that if a document comes to you with the word "through" spelled without the "ough," we might possibly be able to insert the "ough" by respacing the line so as to get in the extra letters. If we could not, we would have to run over each line in that paragraph, or enough lines to finally come out even with good justification.

Mr. LITTAUER. If it was on a plate you would have to destroy the plate and make a new one?

Mr. STILLINGS. No, sir; we could set the paragraph up, electrotype it, and patch it onto the original plate.

Mr. LITTAUER. You would not be able to tell what the expense would be in the case of an ordinary pamphlet of 30 or 35 pages?

Mr. STILLINGS. It is very difficult to estimate.

Mr. BURLESON. Where are the Supreme Court reports printed?

Mr. STILLINGS. Under contract by a commercial printing house. We do a large amount of work for the Supreme Court; the cases, among other items.

Mr. BURLESON. Do you propose to make the change there?

Mr. STILLINGS. They have objected. Recently the question of simplified spelling came up.

Mr. LITTAUER. Is it not going to lead to a great deal of confusion?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. The Supreme Court have refused to follow the simplified mode of spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. And necessarily we are going to have the executive branch of the Government, as to the President's message, spelling one way and another department of the Government spelling another way?

Mr. STILLINGS. That is right.

Mr. BINGHAM. Up to this date have you issued any Government publication using the new spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. There are quite a number of publications that have been issued in the simplified spelling. Here is another point that came up. In the case of a serial which was started last January—and the question came up immediately, Shall we use simplified spelling for the balance of the year or not? Instructions came from the President that wherever the work had been started in the usual spelling it should be continued. The President has been very broad-gauged in the matter of simplified spelling, stating that there was no desire to force this proposition and that if it was not a popular move it would be dropped.

Mr. LITTAUER. Have you had any other protests except from the Supreme Court?

Mr. STILLINGS. We have had a protest from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in connection with the word "gauger;" from the Navy Department also; from the Census Bureau and the Department of Commerce and Labor in connection with work in serial form. We have had a query regarding it from the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

Mr. LITTAUER. What has been the practice in the Government Printing Office; spelling has been to a certain extent changed?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LITTAUER. What recognition of the progression in spelling has the Public Printer taken?

Mr. STILLINGS. We have been largely guided, in fact almost entirely governed, by the action of the publishers of Webster's Dictionary.

Mr. BINGHAM. Is there any difference between the Webster and Worcester Dictionary?

Mr. STILLINGS. I know very little about the Worcester Dictionary; I have not examined it recently.

Mr. ROBINSON, foreman of proof division, Government Printing Office, was questioned as follows:

Mr. LITTAUER. We would like to have you tell us the extra work in the various processes that have to be gone through from one spelling to the other, changing the plates, and so on, and the probable cost that will be entailed by the use of simplified spelling in some publications and not in others.

Mr. ROBINSON. You mean the change from one to the other?

Mr. TAWNEY. An executive document comes to the Public Printer to be printed in the simplified form and is also sent to Congress and becomes an executive document and is printed by Congress in the old form.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the labor of the proof reader and the compositor correcting the work from the new to the old would probably be the principal part of the cost.

Mr. BURLESON. Is there any other difficulty that is involved?

Mr. ROBINSON. I think there is no other difficulty; it is simply a matter of reading the proof and of catching the words, and sending it to the compositor, and the compositor would correct the type.

Mr. LITTAUER. Correcting the type, would not that be an expense?

Mr. ROBINSON. Somewhat, but not very high.

Mr. LITTAUER. How much would it cost if there were ten changes on a page?

Mr. ROBINSON. I estimate that there is not an average of two words to the page ordinarily, and taking the average of those words, the words that require different spaces, I should think a man should correct those pages at the rate of three to five minutes to a page. He is paid 50 cents an hour for that work. He ought to correct twenty pages in an hour.

Mr. LITTAUER. What would be the total expense in a day's work done at the Office?

Mr. ROBINSON. The proof would not necessarily have to be read very carefully, because you are only looking for those particular words.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is 160 pages at a cost of 50 cents an hour?

Mr. ROBINSON. That is for the compositor. The proof reading would cost 50 per cent more. He does not have to read it closely because he is only looking for those words. He only looks for the words that are to be changed from one spelling to another. It would be an experiment—I can not tell exactly, but I think he ought to read 100 pages a day—he might read 150 pages a day.

Mr. TAWNEY. And he gets how much an hour?

Mr. ROBINSON. Fifty-eight and a half cents an hour.

Mr. TAWNEY. And works eight hours a day?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir; the cost would not be over 4 cents a page. I suppose the cost would be from 3 to 4 cents a page.

Mr. BURLESON. When a proof reader has a certain document that he is reading, if it is set up in the simplified method of spelling he reads it a certain way, and if the same proof reader has another document following that in the old style of spelling he has a difficult task of reading one document one way and immediately thereafter reading another document another way. It is a little wearing on his intellectual faculties?

Mr. ROBINSON. There is no doubt about that. I have here a couple of specimens [exhibiting.] There is the new spelling and there is the old spelling. The editor marks it, as you see, and when the proof reader gets that he knows at once what to do with that galley, if he is at all familiar with the list of words.

Mr. BURLESON. He is required to commit those words to memory?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. And he must be familiar with the entire dictionary?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. YOUNG, foreman of printing, Government Printing Office, was questioned as follows:

Mr. LITTAUER. When we come to the plates would there be any greater expense?

Mr. YOUNG. I do not think that would amount to any more.

Mr. LITTAUER. Than the correction of the type?

Mr. YOUNG. No, sir.

Mr. LITTAUER. How much do you think it would cost to make two changes on a page?

Mr. YOUNG. It would probably take five minutes.

Mr. LITTAUER. You would have to handle every plate?

Mr. YOUNG. No; just as I hold this book you would go down to the page that you want and you would take the plate out and correct it and put it back.

Mr. LITTAUER. One man would have to go over the plates and give the correct page plate to another man?

Mr. YOUNG. Not necessarily. He would have to go down to the vault and get it; the plates are not kept upstairs.

Mr. LITTAUER. Can these plates be readily changed from one form of spelling to another?

Mr. YOUNG. They can be changed, but a plate correction is always a bad thing. I do not think a plate correction should ever be made if it can be avoided.

Mr. LITTAUER. The proof reading would be more expensive than the changing of the plate?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. You spoke about these plates, that is, with the 300 words now adopted?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. Now, suppose they adopt the next batch, say, 1,200 words?

Mr. YOUNG. Then it would be out of the question.

Mr. BURLESON. It would increase the number of changes on each page?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. I notice in the report of the Comptroller of the Treasury the spelling is "Controller."

Mr. YOUNG. He sanctioned that.

Mr. TAWNEY. The Comptroller of the Currency refused to accept the form of spelling for his office?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir; he stands on the ground that the statute calls him Comptroller instead of Controller.

Mr. TAWNEY. The statute spells the title of the office of the Comptroller of the Treasury the same as the Comptroller of the Currency?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir; the Comptroller of the Treasury does not take the same view of it that the other man does.

Mr. TAWNEY. The head of every bureau could have his official designation spelled according to his own idea?

Mr. ROBINSON. It is only a matter of opinion. The Comptroller of the Treasury says he will accept either spelling. He says Controller is right, but if we print it Comptroller it is all right—he will accept it.

The Comptroller of the Currency will not have it so.

Mr. TAWNEY. If we have this dual form for the legislative and executive departments of the Government the proof reading is virtually duplicated on all work that first goes to the Printing Office and then is authorized to be reprinted or republished by Congress?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir; anything that emanates from a Department.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is why proof reading is the principal expense in the form of the spelling unless it is made uniform in all the several departments of the Government?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that, as a member of the subcommittee making up this bill, we did not have that length of time to consider the bill that we had last session. We spent several days upon it, looking into the details of the bill.

The usual objections in the Committee of the Whole to increase in salaries, I think, Mr. Chairman, will not prevail at

this time, if Members will remember that in the estimates there were 202 increases called for and the committee has given only 29.

I am aware of the fact that those who are left out will complain and wonder why we put in the 29 increases. It appeared to the Appropriation Committee the right thing to do—the proper thing to do at this time—to increase these 29 salaries. The increases are all set out in the report, and I hope Members will not require me to go over them in detail. Each increase is separately set out in the report. Some of them were, perhaps, more deserving than others. I am informed that the President will send a special message to this House and Senate in a day or two asking an increase all along the line of 20 per cent. This rumor seems to be well founded. I am aware of the fact that a majority of the Keep Commission has recommended an increase all along the line. Of course, it will be left to the wisdom of this House to determine whether we can afford to do that or not. We must take into consideration as a matter of course, the revenues on hand or estimated to be available when we come to disburse the money. That proposition Members will each have to consider for themselves, and will come up later on its merits.

I desire to say just here, and I think every Member upon the floor will bear me out, that the cost of living is getting outrageously high in Washington City. Whether it is simply a rise in the cost of necessities of living—clothes, food, rent, fuel, heat, and light, and of other articles of necessary consumption—or whether it is in part owing to extravagance, I will not undertake to say. The fact exists all the same.

There is one matter left out of this bill, Mr. Chairman, that I want to bring to the attention of southern Members especially. I also want to appeal to all Members to consider fairly and give cotton producers and spinners a square deal. In our last appropriation bill we had this clause:

For compensation at not more than \$10 per day and actual necessary traveling expenses to special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the view of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States, \$50,000, not more than \$20,000 of which shall be used in the investigation of markets for cotton products.

I shall add "and cotton-seed products."

And the result of such investigation shall be reported to Congress. I shall at the proper time move to reinstate the clause.

I am aware of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that our eastern and western friends, that raise no cotton, will say, "Why put in this bill a particular product, as they are interested in other products." Twenty thousand dollars of this amount—\$50,000—is specially appropriated for those things. A Senator at the other end of the Capitol amended and put in \$20,000 for cotton products. You must remember, gentlemen, that while the people of the South raise the cotton, they spin a very small amount of it. That is done by the East and the Middle States; so you are just as much interested as we of the South are. When you remember that out of all the cotton fabrics exported into the world, England made the great bulk of them; four hundred and more millions furnished by her to the other markets of the world, and this country only fifty-seven millions. That is the trouble we are endeavoring to get at. I ask, why do not China and Japan and Russia and the other divisions and subdivisions of the earth buy from us? It is simply because England has pushed her trade and made it apparent to the world that she has the market and the control of this crop and its products.

But if the United States Government will continue this \$50,000 appropriation and this part of it set apart to cotton and its fabrics, the world will soon get acquainted with the fact that we can supply these same goods just as cheaply and of just as good quality, and we will get, perhaps, our share of the commerce of the world on this line. It was this object at first, and it is the object now, if we can reinsert it in the bill.

Again, why should cotton be specified? For the reason that during the last five years, three years out of five, the exportations of cotton have paid the balance against this Government and saved us from a financial panic.

Mr. LITTAUER. The gentleman means raw cotton, does he not?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am speaking about raw cotton now. Any commodity produced in this country that will save us from financial panics ought to have some attention and some legislation, and if we can broaden our markets for raw cotton and its products, it is of the utmost importance that we should do it.

There is also \$30,000 in the amendment to broaden our market for other manufactures. I have no objection to implements and boots and shoes being added, if they were not already cared for and already covered in that \$30,000.

Mr. CANDLER. What is the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The amount of the appropriation is \$50,000, \$30,000 for outside products and \$20,000 for cotton.

Mr. LEVER. Is cotton seed included in that?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Cotton-seed products are included in this amendment, to be inserted in the bill when it is considered under the five-minute rule. I shall offer a motion to reinstate the current law with this amendment, to insert after the word "cotton" the words "and cotton-seed products."

Mr. MANN. What is the item?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is the item in the present law giving \$50,000, of which thirty thousand is given to general manufactured articles and \$20,000 to cotton products.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not refer to the item about commercial agents abroad, does he?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I understand there was an item inserted last year for special agents to investigate trade conditions in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is right.

Mr. MANN. Is that the item the gentleman has reference to?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is the item.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman propose to endeavor to reinsert that item?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do.

Mr. MANN. I am in full sympathy with the gentleman's purpose.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am giving notice of it now, that when we come to that section of the bill under the five-minute rule I will move to reinsert it.

Mr. CANDLER. It was in the bill last year?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is the current law. The point of order can not lie against it. The point of order can lie against my amendment as to cotton-seed products, but it can not lie against the paragraph now current law.

Mr. CANDLER. Do you propose to endeavor to secure the same appropriation as last year?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The same appropriation as the current law. If it were otherwise, it would be subject to a point of order.

There are some limitations on this bill that I want to call your attention to. The first one is:

Hereafter, in printing documents authorized by law and ordered by Congress, or either branch thereof, the Government Printing Office shall follow the rules of orthography established by Webster's or other generally accepted dictionaries of the English language.

There are many reasons why that ought to be done. In the first place every school book in the United States, in every schoolroom, college, or university would have to be abolished, and a new lot of school books republished and bought by the patrons of the schools. That would be an enormous expenditure.

In addition to this enormous expense, it creates derangement and confusion worse confounded in all parts of the Government Printing Office; all the stereotype plates in the Office would have to be reformed. I am not authorized to say what the President's message cost in the saving of 113 words, but the rumor comes from a very good source that it cost \$760 to save those 113 words. I want it understood that I am not stating that authoritatively, but I understand it is about that amount.

It makes no difference, Mr. Chairman, how advantageous it might seem from some point of view, but you can all see at a glance what a revolution this new spelling would work in our schools and colleges, in printing offices, and in every newspaper office throughout the country.

There is another good reason for it. We are tied to a language spoken by people all over the world, and especially in Great Britain and Canada. Now, when we undertake to revolutionize the English language in that way we must consult those who use it with us; it is nothing but right that we should consult them. Are we to follow all along the line a spelling that would follow phonetic pronunciation? If so, then we would have one spelling in France, another in Germany, a different one in the South Central American States, where none pronounce English words as we pronounce them.

There is another limitation here. In the Treasury Department until recently they have always furnished the Committee on Appropriations with an estimate of about how much money we can spend—that is, estimating the revenues for the coming year. The present Secretary refused to do this last year, and your committee, or its chairman and clerk, had to make that estimate. That is not a safe way of doing business. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations must know as near as possible about how much money will be available for appropriations and disbursements. It is made the duty, by this limitation, of the Secretary of the Treasury to give us that estimate.

The next limitation, on page 4, is one which in my opinion by all means should be left in the bill. Let me read it:

SEC. 4. Only such books, periodicals, and pamphlets shall be purchased out of any appropriation made in this or any other act for the use of any library or office or officer as are strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, bureau, office, or officer authorized to use such library or collection of books; and all books, periodicals, and pamphlets which now form a part of or belong to any library or office collection of books and which are not strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, bureau, or office shall be transferred on or before January 1, 1908, to the Library of Congress, except that books of fiction and belles-lettres shall be transferred to the Free Public Library of the District of Columbia, and all expenses of making this transfer, not otherwise sufficiently provided for, shall be paid from appropriations made for contingent expenses of the several Executive Departments or other Government establishments to which this section shall apply.

Some of our departmental libraries we discovered were filled with fiction of the cheapest kind. I am informed that when the Spanish war closed, one of our Departments, finding several thousands of volumes of this cheap fiction on their hands, shipped it all to the Philippines. I don't think that was good policy, for if it was not fit to be read here, it certainly was not fit to send to those people. I am informed that another Department has about 50,000 volumes scattered through the city in the hands of private parties. Our purpose is to draw these books back into the hands of the Departments.

We have gone a step further and provided that any of such books or periodicals in these libraries that do not come within this limitation must be sent to the Carnegie Library of Washington or to the Congressional Library.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether the gentleman is aware of the practice, but it is a fact that in the Light-House Service we have a good many light-houses located off the shore in the water, where the keepers do not get ashore once a month, and sometimes in the winter not as often as that. The Government provides them with a small library. Of course, it would be nonsense to provide them with technical books merely for study. These books are provided for the purpose of reading light literature, and are passed on from one light-house to another.

Mr. LITTAUER. Will the gentleman state under what provision of law those books are furnished?

Mr. MANN. Under an appropriation for light-house supplies, I suppose. I should think that would be a very proper appropriation; they are furnished as other necessities of the light-house.

Mr. LITTAUER. Then they would not belong to the departmental libraries here in Washington?

Mr. MANN. I do not think they would.

Mr. LITTAUER. Then this provision would not apply to them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They could not be affected by this limitation. I would suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that he might offer an amendment to supply all the light-houses from this source instead of having them turned back into the Carnegie and Congressional libraries; they might be contributed to the life-saving stations.

Mr. MANN. It might be a very good way. I had read over the limitation, and I did feel certain that it did not apply.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; it does not apply. I will read it over again:

SEC. 4. Only such books, periodicals, and pamphlets shall be purchased out of any appropriation made in this or any other act for the use of any library or office or officer as are strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, bureau, office, or officer authorized to use such library or collection of books; and all books, periodicals, and pamphlets which now form a part of or belong to any library or office collection of books and which are not strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, bureau, or office shall be transferred, on or before January 1, 1908, to the Library of Congress, except that books of fiction and belles-lettres shall be transferred to the Free Public Library of the District of Columbia, and all expenses of making this transfer, not otherwise sufficiently provided for, shall be paid from appropriations made for contingent expenses of the several Executive Departments or other Government establishments to which this section shall apply.

Mr. MANN. I think it would, myself, the way it reads.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] thinks so, he may make the exception when the bill comes up under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MANN. I wanted to know whether they were intended to cover anything outside of Washington.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They were not. Mr. Chairman, there is another matter which the committee has reported to which I wish to refer. We have increased the salary of the clerks of the Members from \$1,200 to \$1,500. My opinion in the committee—and it is my opinion still—was that these clerks should go on the rolls and have \$1,500 paid to them direct. There are some objections to that. One very good one is that some Members have two clerks and divide the salary between the two, taking one

home with them and leaving one in Washington. There is another objection to it that can be easily met, and that is that the Congressman ought to control his own clerk absolutely, dismiss him when he pleases or reinstate him when he pleases. That can be easily arranged, even if the clerk be on the rolls. The justice and absolute necessity for this increase is patent to every man. It has been charged that we have been taking this amount of money, some of us, and using it as an increase of our own salaries. The committee is not aware of the fact that that has been the practice. We have no proof of it. But to get rid of all scandal—all liability to scandal of every kind—this clerk ought to go on the rolls and be paid by the Sergeant-at-Arms as we are paid, with the power left in the hands of the Member or Delegate to dismiss that clerk at any time. It is not intended, and never was intended, as an increase to our salaries, and on that subject let me say that we purpose in some way or somehow while this bill is under consideration to test this House as to whether you want to increase your salaries or not. If these clerks go on the rolls it can not be charged that we are increasing our salaries indirectly, which is now charged, and if our salaries are not sufficient to decently maintain a Congressman and his family here while the session lasts, then say so to the public and increase your salaries in the bill, and I am sure your constituency will approve it. If you have no reason for it, they will not indorse it.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. What do the clerks of Senators receive aside from those who are employed by the chairmen of committees?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. One thousand eight hundred dollars a year.

Mr. GOULDEN. Why this discrimination between the Senators and the clerks of Members of the House?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There should be none.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is there any explainable reason for it?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There is no reason for it. There is no reason why there should be a difference, and I want to say just here that all salaries ought to be on all fours wherever possible. To have it otherwise creates discontent and unrest. Where one man is doing the same work that another does, in the same hours, spending the same amount of money to live, it is not reasonable, it is not fair, that these differences in salaries should remain as they are now. That condition obtains among our clerks in the Departments, and it ought not to be so. It ought not to be the condition between the House and the Senate, and I am more than willing that the Senate should come down to \$1,500 or that we should go up to \$1,800. If they can show this House that \$1,800 is a fair salary for their clerks, then we ought to put ours up to \$1,800. If they can not do it, then they ought to put theirs down to \$1,500. They certainly ought to be on all fours in this bill. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat I would like to ask him another question. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he regards it as good policy to increase the salaries of the employees of this House when there is a committee regularly appointed to take charge of these matters, and when that committee has had before it many of the salaries that are now proposed to be increased in this bill—whether the gentleman considers that to be good policy and courteous treatment?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I must confess that if there is a committee of this House whose business it is to recommend the increases of salaries of House employees, that perhaps the Appropriations Committee should let those alone. But I understand that there is no salary increased of employees of this House except by the consent of the chairman of that committee, and perhaps the members of that committee.

Mr. GOULDEN. As a member of the Committee on Accounts, I desire to say that a number of these, four or five of them at least, were before our committee in the last session, and were not reported favorably.

Mr. LITTAUER. Which ones?

Mr. GOULDEN. The minority employees and those in the Sergeant-at-Arms department in charge of the pairs were not reported at all, though a strong pressure was brought to bear on the members of the committee, but it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if there is a committee having charge of this matter it should be given the duties as well as responsibilities. I have no objection personally to the matter as reported by the gentleman's committee, but I do think that the committee in charge of the matter, that of Accounts, should at least be treated with courtesy.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the responsibility can not be delivered by the Committee on Appropriations. That responsibility is given by the House and the committee is appointed and its limitation of duty fixed, and therefore we could not give you the authority nor take it away from you, but as a matter of courtesy, I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, if this committee is charged with that duty these increases of salaries of the employees of the House should come from that committee.

Mr. GOULDEN. I agree with you. As I said, personally I have no objection to the increases. I believe in good salaries, and in return would demand faithful services. I merely suggested it belonged to that committee, and I do not think the Committee on Appropriations mean to interfere with the privileges of any committee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me ask the gentleman why he has not acted on these increases?

Mr. GOULDEN. Because we were in doubt whether they were entitled to the increase and for a lack of time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I mean this session.

Mr. GOULDEN. We have not yet had an opportunity to take them up.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will you indorse these increases?

Mr. GOULDEN. It is a very ungracious thing, indeed, to make the point of order which I think would lie against these increases, and I shall not do it as a member of the committee. I do not see the chairman of the Committee on Accounts on the floor of the House, but personally I shall interpose no objection, but let the Committee on Appropriations take the responsibility in the matter.

Mr. LITTAUER. I would like to add one word, if my colleague will permit me, here, and that is the Committee on Appropriations acts upon the estimates and recommendations of the heads of bureaus and departments. The case of the three pair clerks was recommended to the Committee on Appropriations by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House, and consequently considered by them.

Mr. GOULDEN. The same recommendation has been made to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. LITTAUER. That we were not advised of or were not particularly aware of, although we understood last session there was some discussion about this subject.

Mr. GOULDEN. There was considerable.

Mr. LITTAUER. But it came to us and we considered it in the regular way.

Mr. GOULDEN. But does not the gentleman think it would have been at least courteous and right to have ascertained from the Committee on Accounts whether it had taken any action or not?

Mr. LITTAUER. Under the circumstances, yes.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will allow me a word. It was certainly not the desire of the Committee on Appropriations to be discourteous to the gentleman's committee. The information we received came to the committee, as it always does, from the officers of the House in charge or supervision of the subordinate force. As this was a matter distinctly for the House's convenience and comfort of the Members and an expedition of the House's work, we saw no impropriety in placing them in the bill, and certainly no discourtesy was intended toward the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. GOULDEN. I wish to disclaim all intention of reflecting upon the Committee on Appropriations as being discourteous to our committee. I know them individually too well and know that they would not be guilty of anything of the kind.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I presume that some of the Members of this House read, as I did in some of Saturday's papers, that I held up the Committee on Appropriations for three or four hours by a discussion of the new spelling, and in that way had delayed the progress in this House of that bill for that length of time. I only wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that the correspondent who gave that report must have been an easy mark for some ingenious person who had fake news to dispose of, because there was absolutely not the slightest foundation for the statement. The whole discussion in the committee did not take five minutes. It was entirely good humored, and the words which were put in my mouth were fabricated, and the whole statement was without foundation except for the fact that we spent a few minutes very informally in discussing the question. But inasmuch as it has been so exaggerated, and inasmuch as I have had sentiments put into my mouth which I did not ex-

press, I will take now a few minutes to state my position on the subject. I do believe in a simplification of our spelling. I have not been particularly intense in that opinion. Personally, I should have been willing that the movement should go on as it has been going on for many years, simplifying our complicated and barbarous spelling by the constant usage of the public, and of the publishers, and of the newspapers. It seems to me that it is exceedingly desirable that that steady progress should continue, because the English language is gradually becoming the commercial language of the globe.

As we all wish that that process shall continue it seems to me we all must feel that it will tend to increase that progress to have our spelling as simple and methodical as possible and to have the various idiosyncracies and inconsistencies which frighten and confuse a stranger removed as far as can be done without interfering with the etymology or history of words. French has long been the court language of the world, but English is now getting to be the commercial language, and I think in the future courts will be much more likely to take the language of the people than the people will be likely to take the language of the courts, and it is not unreasonable to expect that, as all North America uses English, as Australia uses it, as India is a center for it, and the Philippines is a center for it, it will gradually become a universal commercial language. And so we should all be interested in making that language as simple and uniform as possible. I can see no reason why this steady progress toward simplicity, which we all must observe in our personal usage, should not be hastened. Most of us do not use the letter "u" in "honor" or "candor" any longer, and the most of us spell "plough" "plow."

Most of us are constantly falling in with the simplifications of the language, and now when I am faced with the proposition of shortening 300 specific words on the recommendation of a studious committee of public-spirited men, it seems to me a more rapid step toward accomplishing what our natural instinct is slowly accomplishing, and for that reason I favor it. There is only one objection I have to their list. I confess that the word "through" spelled as "t-h-r-u" does not appeal to me, and I can not see why that spelling was inserted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the gentleman calculated how long it would take to modify the English language at the rate of 300 words a year?

Mr. GILLET. No; I have not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It would take four hundred years. Now, one other question. If you are going into this modification business at all—

Mr. GILLET. May I ask the gentleman what he means by saying that it would take four hundred years to do it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. To remodel the spelling of three hundred thousand words in the English language.

Mr. GILLET. They do not all need it, of course.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The most of them do, as much as these 300 words.

Mr. GILLET. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, another question. If you are going into this remodeling business, why not go the whole hog and take the phonetic system of spelling that has forty-four letters in it, and that absolutely abolishes the task or stunt of learning to spell at all?

Mr. GILLET. That would interfere in many cases with the derivation or history of words. This does not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is not one man out of forty thousand who cares anything about derivation at all, is there?

Mr. GILLET. I think there are many more than that. I do—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, you propose to make a commercial language—

Mr. GILLET. I hope that is what we are growing to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I hope our language will become a commercial language, but these men that are engaged in commerce do not stop to study etymology.

Mr. GILLET. They do not; but does the gentleman mean that he favors the phonetic system?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I mean this, that this 300-words business is such an infinitesimal reform that if I was going into the reform business at all I would at one jump adopt the phonetic system of spelling and the shorthand system of writing, and do away with the double task of learning how to spell and write, the learning how to write the way we write now. Then you would have a reform that is a reform.

Mr. GILLET. The gentleman's suggestion seems to me in accord with many suggestions that are made in this House by gentlemen opposed to a measure. He objects to a slight step on the ground that he would take some other step which everybody knows is impossible. That is what is often done by a Member in this House as a means of defeating a measure. Now, I do not think that such a criticism as that is very weighty. The gentleman knows that we are not going to adopt phonetic spelling. That is impossible at the present. But he also knows that we are every year simplifying our spelling by ordinary use—the ordinary popular use—and here is a simple attempt to somewhat accelerate the progress which is going on from year to year. And as I approve of all of this progress that is going on, so I approve of this acceleration. It is not a revolution. We can not effect any such phonetic revolution as the gentleman suggests. I do not know whether I would favor it, but I do not think it is practicable. We only consider what is before us, and here is a practical suggestion that comes which seems to be sensible and right and in accord with what we are doing all the time. Therefore I shall be very glad if the House will adopt it.

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. MACON. If this simplified spelling were to be adopted, would it not necessitate the abolition of spelling books now being used in all the schools of the country?

Mr. GILLET. Why of course not. Our changing it does not make it necessary to change school books. I have no doubt that in the next edition of the school books they would probably adopt it themselves, but they are not compelled to do it.

Mr. MACON. Then if the school books should not follow it, why do you want it? Why have a boy taught to spell one way and then when he gets through with his education have to learn to spell another way?

Mr. GILLET. The gentleman makes that assumption contrary to the idea that I have been endeavoring to express. I say that the country would follow it up gradually. It does not follow that because we adopt these 300 words this year that all the school books must be changed immediately. It is not a radical revolutionary change. It is a small and moderate change. It does not follow that all the school books must be changed, but they would follow it up gradually. I think many of these words are already spelled so in the school books.

Mr. MACON. If the school books all have to be changed, it would work a hardship on those who have to buy them.

Mr. GILLET. There are only 300 words. It is not a revolution in our spelling. It is only what I have attempted to show before—a little acceleration of the change which is going on every year in the newspapers, and in our own correspondence.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he is in favor of this reform made in the spelling of the word "through" by spelling it "t-h-r-u"?

Mr. GILLET. I do not think that is the correct way, because we pronounce "through" as if it were spelt "t-h-r-o-o" and not "t-h-r-u." It seems to me that entirely confuses the vowels.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But did not the President in his message use the word "t-h-r-u" all the way through? [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLET. I presume he did.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then your remark is a reflection upon the wisdom of the President.

Mr. GILLET. I do not agree with the President in all that he says and does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. GILLET. Now, I just wanted to make this statement of my position, because the newspaper statement of it was an unfounded fabrication. If anybody has anything further to suggest in reference to what I have said—

Mr. SULLIVAN. May I ask the gentleman where he can find any authority under our system of government which enables the President to order the spelling of his message in the manner in which he has done it?

Mr. GILLET. I have not looked into that. I suppose that he has the same right to spell as he chooses that I have and that you have.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would ask, then, whether a member of the present Cabinet who has in his department a printing plant independent of the Government Printing Office has the right to inflict his personal ideas of spelling upon the great body of men who are afterwards to read these public documents; and if so, where does he get that right?

Mr. GILLET. I suppose he has exactly the same authority that I have in writing.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Let me ask this further question. Now,

why is it that the Public Printer spells public documents in a manner other than the usual one? Where does he get the authority to do that?

Mr. GILLET. Who?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The Public Printer.

Mr. GILLET. I say I think he has a right to do so until we tell him differently. He is our servant, and he must obey our directions.

Mr. SULLIVAN. My question is, Whence did he derive that right? From what did it proceed?

Mr. GILLET. Every man has a right to spell as he pleases. I suppose he has the same right that the rest of us have, if he has not any instructions to the contrary. We each of us could order our speeches to be spelled exactly according to our manuscript.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Then the gentleman's idea is that if the Public Printer chose deliberately to misspell all the words in a public document because that method of spelling conformed to his idea of correct spelling, he might continue to do so until Congress ordered him to stop?

Mr. GILLET. I think he might run that risk if he wanted to, but I do not think that is a practical suggestion. Of course no Public Printer would think of doing it. He would very soon receive orders from us.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I think the President's notion of authority is the same as the gentleman's in that particular.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will allow me, perhaps I can elucidate briefly the gentleman's inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, of course.

Mr. BINGHAM. In the report of the hearing, which will be printed in the RECORD to-morrow, in connection with this subject of what is called simplified spelling, I made this inquiry:

Mr. BINGHAM. Is there any statute that gives the President authority in any way to change the spelling—have you looked into that?

Mr. STILLINGS. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then, if a Department should want to change the spelling from what is known as the normal or natural spelling, you would accept the order?

Mr. STILLINGS. Under the order of the President the Departments were ordered to have spelling done that way, and would naturally have to obey the order.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is nothing in the statute that authorizes him to give that order, either for or against that proposition?

Mr. STILLINGS. I do not know as to that.

Mr. BINGHAM. Why did you, then, print these bills under that special spelling?

Mr. STILLINGS. I do not know why it should have been done in this case.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is not the Book of Estimates printed in the same manner?

Mr. STILLINGS. The Book of Estimates emanates from the Treasury Department, and is printed at the Treasury branch. An effort has been made to carry out the President's order in reference to simplified spelling.

Mr. TAWNEY. The Book of Estimates is printed at the Treasury branch?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. This bill is printed in your office?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. In printing this bill, then, your employees must have followed the spelling contained in the Book of Estimates?

Mr. STILLINGS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TAWNEY. And that is how it came about?

Mr. STILLINGS. Yes, sir; if this was copied from a departmental document which was prepared on the simplified spelling lines.

Mr. TAWNEY. What was the President's order, and have you a copy of it?

Mr. STILLINGS. I have not a copy here.

I will state to the gentleman that there will be printed with my remarks to-morrow the full order of the President to Mr. Stillings, the Public Printer.

Mr. GILLET. I should suppose that naturally the Public Printer would print and his natural duty would be to print every document according to the manuscript sent, but I suppose, out of kindness to us, if he sees a mistake in our copy, he naturally corrects it, and I suppose he goes by some standard dictionary.

Mr. LITTAUER. The custom has been to follow Webster.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman draw a distinction between an official document and a private letter?

Mr. GILLET. Of course there are differences. I do not know just what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. For instance, I have a right to spell my name as I please, whether intentionally or ignorantly; but when the President is writing an official document to Congress should he not confine his spelling to the usual form as found in our statutes?

Mr. GILLET. I think he could use Greek if he wanted to.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, he might use Moro or Tagalog, Filipino or German.

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly, I think that is entirely in his discretion.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Or he might send a message here in Latin.

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do you think the President would have that right?

Mr. GILLETT. I do. I think he could use what language or what spelling he chose.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Suppose he should issue a military proclamation affecting the Army or Navy of the United States, affecting the life, liberty, or property of a member of either, and that proclamation should come before the Supreme Court of the United States for consideration, and the President should spell it in his own way or get up a new word for each idea he undertook to express. Do you not think that the Supreme Court would be extremely embarrassed and would have to send for the President's dictionary, and possibly for the President himself to come and translate that message? It could be carried to that extreme, of course.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman is confusing two things, it seems to me; he is confusing the right and the expediency. I think the President, or anyone else, has the right to spell and publish as he pleases. Of course in practice we are all going to exercise reason and good sense.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Suppose he should spell the word "due" in this passage from the Constitution "due process of law"—suppose he should spell it "d-e-w." Do you not think that would be confusing to a man who was imprisoned under an order of the President, and would it not be confusing to the Supreme Court if his case should go there?

Mr. GILLETT. I don't think it would confuse the man.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Don't you think it would confuse the court?

Mr. GILLETT. No.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Has not the Chief Justice been already confused by this new spelling?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know that he has. It might displease the court.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The Chief Justice asked a member of the bar—an officer of the Department of Justice, I believe—who had spelled a word in the Rooseveltian method, what he meant by it. The gentleman sees to what confusion it would yield.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman from Tennessee is not distinguishing between expediency and the right.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman from Massachusetts goes to the extent of saying that the President has a right to do what he pleases with official documents in spelling, and I take the ground that he has no right to do it, especially in matters that may come before the Supreme Court or Congress.

Mr. GILLETT. I think the President has the same right that we all have—to spell as he pleases.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I know that the President wants to do right. I am a great admirer of President Roosevelt, but I am talking about the ridiculous proposition of having a message sent here to Congress spelled one way and Congress printing it as spelled in the RECORD, and alongside of it the proceedings of Congress spelling the identical same words in a different way.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] if he is a member of this Amalgamated Association for Simplified Spelling? [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETT. No; I am not.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me, I want to read the President's letter to Mr. Stillings. It is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
OYSTER BAY, N. Y., August 27, 1906.

MY DEAR MR. STILLINGS: I inclose herewith copies of certain circulars of the Simplified Spelling Board, which can be obtained free from the board at No. 1 Madison avenue, New York City. Please hereafter direct that in all Government publications of the Executive Departments the 300 words enumerated in Circular No. 5 shall be spelled as therein set forth. If anyone asks the reason for the action, refer him to Circulars 3, 4, and 6, as issued by the Simplified Spelling Board. Most of the criticism of the proposed step is evidently made in entire ignorance of what the step is, no less than in entire ignorance of the very moderate and common-sense views as to the purposes to be achieved, which views are so excellently set forth in the circulars to which I have referred. There is not the slightest intention to do anything revolutionary or initiate any far-reaching policy. The purpose simply is for the Government, instead of lagging behind popular sentiment to advance abreast of it and at the same time abreast of the views of the ablest and most practical educators of our time, as well as of the most profound scholars—men of the stamp of Professor Lounsbury and Professor Skeat.

If the slight changes in the spelling of the 300 words proposed wholly or partially meet popular approval, then the changes will

become permanent without any reference to what public officials or individual private citizens may feel; if they do not ultimately meet with popular approval they will be dropped, and that is all there is about it. They represent nothing in the world but a very slight extension of the unconscious movement which has made agricultural implement makers and farmers write "plow" instead of "plough," which has made most Americans write "honor" without the somewhat absurd, superfluous "u;" and which is even now making people write "program" without the "me"—just as all people who speak English now write "bat," "set," "dim," "sum," and "fish." Instead of the Elizabethan "batte," "sette," "dimme," "summe," and "fyshe;" which make us write "public," "almanac," "era," "fantasy," and "wagon," instead of the "publick," "almanack," "aera," "phantasy," and "waggon" of our great-grandfathers. It is not an attack on the language of Shakespeare and Milton, because it is in some instances a going back to the forms they used, and in others merely the extension of changes which, as regards other words, have taken place since their time. It is not an attempt to do anything far-reaching or sudden or violent; or indeed anything very great at all. It is merely an attempt to cast what slight weight can properly be cast on the side of the popular forces which are endeavoring to make our spelling a little less foolish and fantastic.

Sincerely, yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Hon. CHARLES A. STILLINGS,
Public Printer, Washington.

Mr. GILBERT. It seems that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and all the members of that committee concede that this is not a governmental matter; that in spite of any legislation that we may enact, every college, every school, every teacher, every individual may still adhere to the old method of spelling. Now, would not the adoption of that new method tend to create a greater disorder and a greater degree of confusion in spelling rather than more harmony?

Mr. BINGHAM. All I can say to the gentleman is that we think that the qualification in this proposed amendment is right. It will come duly before the committee when we reach that paragraph in the bill, which will be early in its consideration. It reads as follows:

Hereafter in printing documents authorized by law or ordered by Congress or either branch thereof the Government Printing Office shall follow the rules of orthography established by Webster's or other generally accepted dictionaries of the English language.

It is simply, so far as this proposed amendment or legislation goes, a continuation of the existing system and existing orthography. That is its sole purpose. Now, the committee believe that in view of the presentation of the Book of Estimates of the bill that goes with it for the consideration of the committee, all that comes from the Secretary of the Treasury in official form for our consideration should be spelled in the usual system of orthography.

Mr. GILBERT. What I want to know is this: Is not Congress making itself ridiculous and absurd to enter upon that subject at all?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not think that the committee before whom the proposition is submitted in the form of a document to that committee, coming from the Secretary of the Treasury, makes it ridiculous in taking the sense of the committee and calling attention of Congress to it.

Mr. GILBERT. Might we not as well spend our time in regulating the color of our cravats? [Laughter.]

Mr. LITTAUER. If the gentleman will permit me, the Committee on Appropriations is concerned with this matter from the financial and economical standpoint. We were met by the statement that if we were to continue two kinds of spelling in printing documents the extra cost in producing the publications of the Government would be a considerable one. The use of two methods would involve an extra cost for proof reading, an extra cost for changing type, and so forth.

Consequently, we felt that in trying to bring about economic administration of the Public Printer's office, it was well that some official mandate should be given where the authority rested to determine that the work of the Public Printer should be conducted in the most economic and, even, as we also believe, the proper way. The order of the President we recognize, but we also recognize the intimation—not the dictum—of the Supreme Court that if you are going to quote law in a printed brief you must quote it as the law reads and not quote it with some new style of spelling. Then other Departmental officers refused to have the spelling of their designations changed, because they are statutory. If we were to continue here or after in all these publications the necessity of having the proof reader go over them twice in order to inject this new spelling, and then for the printers and the plate makers and so on to change their work, it is quite plain that we will add considerable to the cost of the Public Printer's work; and it is from the standpoint of cost that we have submitted this matter of legislation here.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is entirely right, but that is apart from the question I propounded to the gentleman. We know that in the times of Queen Elizabeth the Parliament of England would sit for months fixing the price of tinware, of hats and shoes, etc., and we know that in the time

of Louis XIV the States-General would sit to settle questions of etiquette before the court; and I do not want the Congress of the United States to be guilty of what seems to me a piece of folly in passing a piece of legislation that no court would pay any attention to as being any part of any governmental function to be exercised by any Congress.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman will understand this, that we are dealing just with the official documents, so far as this House or so far as Congress is concerned. Now, one point—the printing is in the simplified form, we will say. The question was put to Mr. Young, foreman of the Government Printing Office, on page 44 of the hearing, as follows:

Mr. LITTAUER. Can these plates be readily changed from one form of spelling to another?

Mr. YOUNG. They can be changed, but a plate correction is always a bad thing. I do not think a plate correction should ever be made if it can be avoided.

Mr. LITTAUER. The proof reading would be more expensive than the changing of the plates?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. You spoke about these plates—that is, with the 300 words now adopted?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. Now, suppose they adopt the next batch, say 1,200?

Mr. YOUNG. Then it would be out of the question.

That is the testimony of a practical man in that office.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does not the President of the United States have the right to authorize the reprint of certain executive documents?

Mr. BINGHAM. That I can not answer. I presume he has that right.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. We have a great many maps, for instance—

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit, I will say that the President has not that right.

Mr. LITTAUER. The Public Printer is under Congress.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. We order these executive documents containing these fine plates. They are the ordinary spelling. Under this new way of spelling all these plates would have to be changed, and it would cost a great deal of money to do it, of course, and take up a great deal of time, and so forth. Is that what the gentleman from whom you quote had in mind when he spoke about the "plates?"

Mr. BINGHAM. That is what the gentleman had in mind, all plates. He simply states that they can handle the 300 words, but when it comes to 1,200 or 1,500 words it is out of the question.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I will state, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], that we have public documents that are printed in accordance with law and we have others printed by order of Congress. Now, under the present the Executive documents that are sent down to the printer to be printed, coming directly from the Executive Department to the Government Printing Office, will be printed under the Executive order in accordance with the rule of simplified spelling. Then these same documents come to Congress and they go back to be printed by Congress for the use of Congress. The proof must all be reread, unless Congress specifically adopts the simplified form of spelling, thereby giving direction to the Public Printer, who is under the control of Congress, giving him an authority to reprint these documents or have them printed identically in the same form of spelling they were printed in when they came from the Executive Department.

Mr. GILLET. Why would that be necessary? Why, without the explicit declaration of Congress, could not the Public Printer send it here in the simplified spelling, if we did not say we would not permit it?

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, I suppose that the Public Printer construes the order of the Executive to relate only to publications that are printed under authority of law and by direction of the Executive Department. I do not think the Public Printer would consider the order of the Executive to apply to publications that are printed by authority of Congress. While it was not stated in the hearings, he said to me that he would expect before printing the documents that are printed by authority of Congress in the simplified form of spelling, he would expect Congress to give some direction otherwise, or in the absence of any direction he would feel bound to go on and print the documents printed by authority of Congress in the manner that has heretofore obtained.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Did the Public Printer have any instructions in reference to printing the Record?

Mr. TAWNEY. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understand the chairman of the Committee

on Printing of the House has made some announcement, at least there was an announcement in the press, whether he did to the Printer or not, that the RECORD would be printed in the usual form of spelling. I do not think he had any direction one way or the other.

Mr. MANN. And which, of course, I suppose, would carry with it the printing of those documents referred by the Speaker to be printed.

Mr. TAWNEY. Absolutely.

Mr. MANN. So that unless there is some legislative action one way or the other we will be put in the position of having the same documents printed by the same printing office for the Government one lot spelled in one way and another lot spelled in another way.

Mr. TAWNEY. Exactly.

Mr. MANN. And if there should be a third edition issued of those documents I suppose they would have to toss a copper to see how the third edition should be spelled.

Mr. TAWNEY. It would require some legislative action. The purpose of this provision to secure uniformity in spelling in all public documents that are issued by the Executive Departments and subsequently referred to Congress, or referred to Congress as Executive documents and then having them printed under authority of Congress. The purpose is to have uniformity in spelling and save the expense of duplication work and expense.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Do you not think if you let this subject alone it will result in uniformity?

Mr. TAWNEY. It has not.

Mr. SOUTHARD. So far as Government printing is concerned.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I desire to make an inquiry. Perhaps I am a little obtuse or have some wrong impressions. I understand there is no standard fixed by law now; that it is a question of custom at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. MANN. There is a standard fixed by the Government Printing Office.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Not fixed by the Government Printing Office?

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understand it is just a custom and usage; that there is no law.

Mr. MANN. They have rules at the Government Printing Office which themselves in many cases violate the dictionaries. I will say to the gentleman that they do not follow the dictionaries in all cases by any means.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Those rules simply refer to a standard or an accepted usage; that is all. Now, the Public Printer can conform, in the absence of any legislation, to this new standard. It is not necessary that Congress should—let me ask, does the chairman of the Committee on Printing have authority to fix the standard of printing for Congressional documents? I assume not. I think that requires an act of Congress. The whole question, I understand, is open now; that the public printing except in so far as it has been directed by the President of the United States in respect to certain classes of publications—all the balance is a matter discretionary with him, a matter of taste, a matter of usage.

Mr. BINGHAM. Now let me read what he says about that.

Mr. LITTAUER. What recognition of the progress in spelling has the Public Printer taken?

Mr. STILLINGS. We have been largely guided, in fact almost entirely governed, by the action of the publishers of Webster's Dictionary.

I merely give you that.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I insist that the situation—

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GILLET. I yield now to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The situation is simply this: It is simply a matter of practice or a matter of custom that there is no lawful standard of spelling for public documents.

Mr. TAWNEY. Except in so far as the Executive order proposes to make a lawful standard.

Mr. MANN. That is purely a matter of taste. The Public Printer is not required to follow the law. It is utterly beyond the law.

Mr. TAWNEY. And if we do not enact any legislation the Public Printer may make documents conform to the Executive standard; he may use the Executive standard for printing some classes of documents and some other standard in relation to others.

Mr. GILLET. I had not thought of this, but I must confess at first blush I would go a step further than the gentleman. I would say that if I made a speech here and sent it down to the

Public Printer and told him I wanted it spelled in a particular way that I have a right to have it spelled in the way I say.

Mr. MANN. He would not do it. He would not spell it that way, either.

Mr. CLAYTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLAYTON]?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. We understand from the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] that there is no law compelling the Public Printer to spell in any particular way, no positive law, no legislative enactment; but does not the Executive order of the President, whose appointee he is, bind him to the extent that the President may remove him if he does not conform to his directions? Would not he do it, knowing the President as you know him, and that when he says a thing he generally has some meaning to it? Do you not think he would discharge the Public Printer if he did not conform to his directions?

Mr. GILLETT. I think his recommendation to the Public Printer is very apt to receive the Public Printer's careful consideration.

Mr. CLAYTON. The Public Printer is a wise man and onto his job.

Mr. NORRIS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]?

Mr. GILLETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORRIS. If it be true, and it seems to me that it is, that the duty of the printer, either public or otherwise—if we are going to be at all technical about it—is to spell as the manuscript before him is spelled. He ought, it seems to me, as the gentleman has suggested, if he is requested to print his speech for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the reform method of spelling, to spell it that way. For the same reason the President ought to be allowed to control such things as emanate from the Executive Department, and they ought to be settled in accordance with the manuscript that he sends to the Printing Office to have printed.

Mr. SOUTHARD. In every case?

Mr. NORRIS. I should think so. It is the duty of the printer, and I can see that it is, to simply print what is given to him in the shape of manuscript. He ought to follow it, and if it comes from the Executive Department it would be his duty to follow it, and he ought to be removed if he does not follow it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am not asking the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] to yield. I want some time in my own right.

Mr. GILLETT. All right. I have finished, Mr. Chairman. I am very glad that the gentleman from Missouri can take the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this matter is not so much of a joke as it might seem at first blush. I most heartily indorse what the Committee on Appropriations did in this matter when they say:

Hereafter in printing documents authorized by law or ordered by Congress or either branch thereof the Government Printing Office shall follow the rules of orthography established by Webster's or other generally accepted dictionaries of the English language.

In the beginning I wish to modify one remark that I made to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] a little while ago. I asked him if it were not true that there is not more than one citizen of the United States out of 40,000 interested in the origin or etymology of words. Of course I know that was a very extravagant question myself. What I meant was this, that the number of persons who are interested in etymology or the derivation of words is very small in comparison with the entire population of the United States. I have spent some time, and I have no doubt that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] has spent some time, ransacking the dictionaries to find out the derivation of words. Before I got to be as busy as I am now I spent a good deal of time at it. It is fascinating work. I started out to be a precisian in the use of words. Law and politics lured me from that ambitious project. It vanished along with many other dreams of my youth. But that is neither here or there. Before the President issued his remark-

able ukase there was no trouble in this country about spelling. Everybody either tried to conform his spelling to the generally accepted authorities or he paid no attention to the authorities at all and spelled to suit himself.

I will not go as far as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] went in saying that this order of the President makes "confusion worse confounded." I think that is an extravagant statement, too. But I do think that it makes a muddle where there was no sense in having any muddle. Some time before very long the people of the United States are going to insist on having a President who will attend strictly to his own constitutional functions and expend his energies only on subjects of great pith and moment. As to the Public Printer, his duty, without any statute on the subject, is to conform the spelling of these public documents that he has charge of to the usually accepted authorities in the matter of spelling, and that is what he would have done if he had been left alone. That he feels under obligations to conform his action to this order of the President I have no doubt. Failure to do so would, in all probability, mean that he would soon be ex-Public Printer. The truth is that the Public Printer has at times exercised prerogatives which nobody ever intended that he should exercise. I had a very interesting experience with the first speech I ever made in this House. I am not at all certain that any public speaker in this country, except the preacher or the lawyer or the doctor delivering a lecture, has any right to incorporate into his speech any sentence or phrase from a foreign language, because our language is the richest and most flexible ever spoken by the children of men. It grows richer and more flexible every day.

If anybody does not believe that it is the most flexible, all that he has to do is to read Don Juan to discover the most complete illustration of the flexibility of the English language. I would not recommend Don Juan to a boarding school, but in that great poem Lord Byron gave a marvelous demonstration of the flexibility of our vernacular. Our language is a hash language. Perhaps it would be in better taste to say a composite language or a verbal mosaic. It is built on a basis of German, which we often call Anglo-Saxon, a palpable misnomer, and there have been grafted on it words from every language of the world, ancient or modern. Whenever we need a new word we simply reach out into somebody else's vocabulary and appropriate it. But to return to my mutton: In the first speech I ever made here of course I made every effort to put my best foot forward. I wrote it and rewrote it and boiled it down and polished it and committed it to memory [laughter]; and I am not at all certain that it would not be better if we all did that all the time now. We would make fewer speeches, but better ones, no doubt. I wanted to be sure that I was putting the best foot forward, so I quoted a Latin sentence: "*Facilis descensus averni*."—"Easy the road to the deuce." I sent it down to the Printing Office, and they sent it back changed to "*Facilis descensus averno*," which is only the change of one letter. But I did not propose that the Public Printer should doctor up my speech, and I wanted to be certain that it was correct the way I had it. Looking over here within 40 or 50 feet I saw the most universal scholar who has been in the House in my time—Dr. William Everett, of Massachusetts—so I went to him. I presented the question to him, and he said: "Well, it does not make much difference. They both mean substantially the same thing; they are both grammatically correct; but I believe that the weight of authority is on your side."

So I sent it off to the Public Printer. In about twenty minutes Doctor Everett wrote me a note stating: "I have been investigating the matter and there are four accepted readings for that line. *Facilis descensus averni*; *facilis descensus averno*; *facilis descensus averni est*, and *facilis descensus averno est*; and the Public Printer is right." He told me afterwards that he had twenty-six editions of Virgil—twenty-three more than I knew before had been printed. Thus I settled my matter with the Public Printer.

In the shape in which this question now arises it is a practical problem. A gentleman asked me if I am in favor of phonetic spelling. I am not certain whether we could adopt it, but if we could there is no question that if we had the phonetic system of spelling which has forty-four letters in it we would absolutely save two years of the time that a child is learning to spell. They are natural-born spellers. Take any child—and every school-teacher on the floor of the House knows it—and give him the word "owl" to spell, he would spell it "ow-l" instead of "o-w-l," two letters instead of three, because there is the one sound represented by the two letters "o" and "w." If you take the forty-four letters you will have every sound included in the language. Then if you adopt the shorthand system of writing—

and you can learn that as well as you can the system we now write—you will save from three to five years in the life of every citizen in this Republic in getting an education.

There is something practical about that, but there are three arguments against that. All the etymologists will be against it. The men who want to learn the derivation of words will be against it. Every printed book in the English language is an argument against it, and every human being who has learned to spell in the usual way is a living, moving argument against it. They do not want to take the trouble to learn to spell any other way. But there is no doubt that if that system were adopted two or three years in the life of every child now living and during the life of every child to be born in the future would be saved in the matter of getting an education.

As to this order of the President, it is absolutely pitiable. It produces confusion without doing any good. I undertake to say that if you take the scholars of the House, such as my learned friend from Massachusetts, and ask them to pick 300 words for the experiment in simplified spelling no two would pick the same words and no two would agree on the spelling of the 300 words. The President says "thru;" but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] objects to spelling the word "through" in the way that the President spelled it all through his message—"thru"—because in certain places the letter "u" has a different sound from what it has in the word "through." The gentleman from Massachusetts would spell it "throo," because, so he thinks, "u" never has the sound of "oo." Now, that is all a question of geography. It depends on the section of country you are in as to whether certain sounds prevail. For instance, the word "calf" is as much entitled, under Webster's Standard Dictionary, to be pronounced "c-a-w-f" as "palm" is entitled to be pronounced "p-a-w-m;" yet let a man go into an agricultural section of the country, where they raise calves, and go around through the country talking about a c-a-w-f, and he will run good risk of having a writ de lunatico inquiring sworn out for him.

The changing of the spelling of these 300 words does not do any good. It simply muddles things.

Mr. GILLET. Does not the gentleman think that this simplification of spelling, which, of course, he knows is going on slowly all the time, is a desirable thing?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, certainly I do.

Mr. GILLET. Then here are 300 words, most of them being changed very slightly. Why is not the adoption of this list an acceleration of the progress in that direction? Why does the gentleman say it is so confusing?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It gets up two systems of spelling right away.

Mr. GILLET. Every change gets up two systems of spelling.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know, but it is very gradual.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On the very point you are talking about, take the word "thru." That might spell "through" in German, it might spell "through" in half a dozen languages, but the English "u" is never pronounced "oo," and you can not make "throo" out of it. In New England there is a disposition to make "oo" sound out of "u," the old English "u." In other parts of the world "u" is pronounced "eu," and if the President was going to spell phonetically he might have done better by using "throo." This is just an illustration of the wonderful diversities of opinion which will spring up at once as to how you are going to make the spelling correspond with the sound.

Mr. GILLET. I do not think you can suggest a single other word in the list of 300 as to which the same thing is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is just the old question of "shibboleth" and "sibboleth" over again. One of the most distinguished Members of the House (I will not name him, because it might seem invidious) invariably pronounces the word "does" as though it were spelled "doos." He is not going to agree to this simplified scheme of spelling. But what I was trying to get at is the practical part of it, in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET]. I say that the spelling of the English language is a growth, and every man who has ever read Chaucer, and from him on up, knows that very thing.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If all of these changes mean growth, then where growth has taken place why should not the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as well as the other literature of the country, accept it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, these 300 words have not developed as a growth yet.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Oh, I think they have.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They have not. Here is where the

trouble comes in about it. All over this country, without any law about it except the law of custom, where we get the common law, we have been accepting Webster's Dictionary as the established authority, or Worcester's or some of the rest of them. Now, there must be somewhere in the neighborhood of from fifty to seventy-five thousand school-teachers in the United States, and maybe more. They apply for school certificates under the statutes of their States. In Missouri we have three or four different kinds of certificates. If they stand such and such an examination, they get a certificate for life. If they stand another test, they get a certificate for five years, but the most of them get yearly certificates. Spelling is one of the things on which they are examined. I always did doubt whether there was any sense in examining anybody on spelling, because it is largely a matter of memory, except in the case of scholars who go into the derivation of words. Suppose some of these faddists got hold of these examinations, and a teacher should come up for examination; these 300 words are in the list; and the teacher spells every one of them according to the authorized standard dictionary. That teacher gets zero on spelling when graded by a faddist.

Another thing about it. We appoint boys to West Point and to Annapolis. They are examined on spelling. They are graded on spelling. Now, inasmuch as this question has been raised, suppose they set up this improved standard of spelling, but suppose they do not tell the boys what standard they are going to be judged by. Then they take enough words out of this preferred list of correctly spelled words under the new system, 300, to make up that examination, and the boys spell them according to the old standard. Every one of them gets zero on spelling.

No sensible man will sanction such rank injustice as that.

Then turn it round the other way. Suppose the applicants for school certificates and the appointees to West Point and Annapolis all believe in the simplified spelling, and these 300 words are given them to spell and they spell them according to the new style and the examiners all believe in the old style, the result is again zero in spelling for them all.

No sensible man will sanction such rank injustice as that.

Mr. GILLET. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he does not have exactly that difficulty now with such words as "honor" and "candor," which are among the list of 300. They are spelled sometimes o-u-r and sometimes o-r. According to the theory of the gentleman, he would have the same difficulty to-day when a boy passed an examination. There are two standards, and you can not say that this one is right or that one is right; both are right. The 300 words are words of that kind which already have two classes of spelling, and that confusion exists now. This simplifies and recognizes one spelling instead of the other.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Common usage in this country has left the "u" out of the second syllable in all such words as "honor," "candor," etc.

Mr. GILLET. They are spelled both ways by the standard dictionaries.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know they are, but they are not spelled both ways by the bulk of the people, and the majority have as much right to determine the system of spelling as the system of government.

Mr. GILLET. The boy would be right in spelling it either way.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know he would.

Mr. GILLET. And so he would with any of the 300 words.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The main thing to be said about this is that it produces confusion without doing any good. I say that inasmuch as the question was raised, the Committee on Appropriations did well to bring in this proviso and let us express our opinion about it. I am willing to go the whole hog on reformed or simplified spelling, but I am not willing to take 300 words out of 120,000 and pester ourselves and everybody else with this new-fangled orthography. At that rate we would require 400 years to make a new dictionary, and then some, for while we are correcting the 120,000 words we now have we would accumulate a few thousand new words which would need correcting.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] asked me to control the time in his absence. I now yield as much time as he wants to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON].

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to speak upon the subject of appropriations at this time, nor shall I speak but a short while upon any other subject; but, sir, there is one question that, in my judgment, concerns the farming interests of this country more than any other, and to that cause do I propose to address myself at this hour.

A good many years ago I happened to be a member of the

legislature of the State of Arkansas, and while serving in that capacity I prepared and introduced a bill in that body to prevent the dealing in futures in agricultural products. The legislature saw fit to enact the measure into law, and the result was that bucket shops and agricultural gamblers and speculators were driven out of business in that State for the time being; but the interested parties were not willing to abide by the action of the legislature, and hence made a test case of the question in the courts of the State upon the ground that the law was unconstitutional in that it conflicted with that clause of the constitution which prohibited a legislative enactment in restraint of trade. The supreme court of the State, however, held that the law was not in conflict with the constitution, that it did not restrain legitimate trade in any sense of the word, and consequently every little bucket shop was driven from the State; but later the question was before the Supreme Court of the United States, and there it was held that a legislature of a State could not enact a law that would prevent a citizen of one State from having a future transaction with a citizen of another State upon the ground that it would be interfering with interstate transactions. In order, therefore, that the State law might become effective, it became necessary under the holding of the Supreme Court that Congress should pass a law preventing or prohibiting interstate transactions of that character. As soon as the Supreme Court holding was made known to me I resolved that if I was ever in a position to do so I would do everything in my power to have the Congress of the United States pass a law prohibiting interstate buying or selling or otherwise dealing in what is known as futures in so far as it affected agricultural products. So when I had the good fortune to become a member of this body I took the matter up, and I discovered that Senator BERRY, a distinguished Senator from my own State, had introduced a bill of similar character in the Senate and that it was then pending before that body. Considering his long service in the Senate entitled him to recognition upon the question as against myself, I did not introduce a bill upon the subject during the early days of my service here.

But it has been decreed that he must retire from legislative life on the 4th day of March next. Knowing that fact, I did not consider that the proprieties required that I longer wait upon his action in the matter, and hence I have prepared and introduced in this body, for the earnest consideration of its membership, the bill that I now send to the Clerk's desk to be read in my time and to be made a part of my remarks upon the subject under consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20554) to prohibit interstate buying or selling or otherwise dealing in what is known as futures.

Be it enacted, etc., That interstate buying or selling or otherwise dealing in what is known as futures, either in cotton, meat, grain, or any other agricultural product whatsoever, is hereby declared to be unlawful.

SEC. 2. That whoever shall so engage in buying or selling or otherwise dealing in futures in the United States of America, either in cotton, meat, grain, or any other agricultural product, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not less than \$1,000 or imprisoned not less than one year, or both.

SEC. 3. That no letter, postal card, circular, newspaper, pamphlet, or writing or publication of any other kind containing money or any other representative of value or information of any character to be used in any manner connected with, concerning, or in furtherance of any project or transaction pertaining to the buying or selling or otherwise dealing in what is known as futures, either in cotton, meat, grain, or any other agricultural product, shall be carried in the mail or delivered at or through any post-office or branch thereof or by any letter carrier or other postal agent or authority. Whoever shall knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited, or who shall knowingly send or cause to be sent, anything to be conveyed or delivered in violation of this section, or who shall knowingly deliver or cause to be delivered by mail anything

SEC. 4. That all laws in conflict with this act be, and they are hereby, than \$500 or by imprisonment for not less than six months, or both. demeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not less herein forbidden to be carried by mail, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, it is known of all men that the farmers of the world sustain it and that they have done so since its foundation. Therefore, if any class of people on earth are entitled to recognition by way of legislative enactment, they are entitled to it. Civilization, prosperity, comfort, and happiness owe more to the farmers than to any other class of people on earth, for, as stated, they have sustained the earth from its creation. Without the fruits of the farmers' toil, lawyers, doctors, bankers, merchants, mechanics—nay, sir, every other class of citizens upon the face of the earth—must within about nine days after the farmers' products give out be sent to their grave by the pangs of starvation, or else become cannibals, feasting upon their fellows, or wild men living upon the herbs and berries of the forests. In addition to producing every morsel of food upon which man subsists the farmer produces every rag of apparel that shields his form from the freezing blasts of a winter's storm or the scorching rays of a summer's sun. Then, sir,

if the farmers be the one class that feed and clothe the peoples of every character, I can see that it is the highest duty of the people's representatives to consider their cause first when they come to the enactment of law bearing upon any subject. But, sir, strange as it may seem, instead of considering the farmers' cause first, it is nearly always put aside to the last, and when the time does come to consider them the Congress is so busy in winding up its business that it can not find time to give any thought whatever to the farmer or his cause. The farmers of the country, recognizing the havoc that has been annually wrought to their cause by the dealing in futures in their products, have petitioned legislatures and Congresses from time to time to enact some law that would relieve them from the great evil that necessarily came of such gambling transactions. Last year the farmers of this country produced about 550,000,000 dollars worth of cotton, more than a billion dollars worth of corn, and nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars worth of wheat, and yet there were several hundred times as many bales of cotton, bushels of corn and wheat sold by the stock gamblers of the country as were raised. Sold in competition with the honest product, of the honest toil, of the honest farmer, and by reason of that nefarious practice prices were run up and down at the will of the speculator, so as to cause havoc with the honest price of the product from one day to another throughout the year. I have seen cotton fluctuate in price as much as \$10 a bale within as many hours. There was no apparent reason for such a change in price other than the will of the gambling speculator. Such a practice is destructive of all honest value of the product and results in the enrichment of the speculator and the impoverishing of the men who produce it.

Mr. Chairman, aside from the great injury done the farmer by the bucket shops of the country, good citizens of every community have been wooed by them to a financial doom. These good citizens are told that some one invested a hundred dollars yesterday and made as much or more upon the investment, and hence they are encouraged to place their hard-earned coin upon the turn of the wheel of the speculator and are drawn into a whirlpool of ruin before they can extricate themselves from the great danger that always attends such investments. When they lose, as they nearly always do, they are then told by these captains of the bucket-shop industry that if they will try their fortune again they are sure they will come out all right and win back what they lost on the other transaction. Thus they are led on, step by step, until they become out-and-out gamblers themselves. To show to what extremes these speculators will go in order to lure the good citizenship of the country into their net, I will send a letter to the Clerk's desk to be read that I received from Mr. W. H. Avery, of Eldorado, Kans., and a letter that he inclosed me in the one just mentioned, written by J. K. Comstock & Co., of Chicago, to Mr. W. S. Avery, of Eldorado.

The Clerk read as follows:

ELDORADO, KANS., December 6, 1906.

Hon. Mr. MACON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice that you have introduced a bill to do away with "bucket shops." I inclose a letter from one of these concerns. Such letters are received about twice each month, and are usually sent to young men working on salary, and this man has in some instances gotten all their wages. I hope your bill will become a law at this session of Congress.

Very respectfully,

W. H. AVERY.

CHICAGO, December 3, 1906.

Mr. W. S. AVERY, Eldorado, Kans.

DEAR SIR: There is certainly going to be something "doing" in this wheat market, and it may be this coming week, and if you will only take a risk of \$6.25 or \$12.50 you will stand an excellent chance of getting 5,000 or 10,000 bushels of wheat for this small amount of money. On Friday, December 7, you can buy ups on May wheat 1½ cents away from the closing price of market on that day for eight days and 2½ cents away for fifteen days, and if the advance comes as we expect it will be for 4 or 5 cents, and you can figure your profit as well as we can. Each 1 cent advance above your up price means \$50 profit for each \$6.25 invested.

Wheat is cheap, and here is your opportunity. If market closes lower than 79 cents on Friday, so much the better for you and your purchase. If above 79 cents, it shows advance has started sooner than we expected. Everything is in your favor.

Don't delay. Send order by return mail so we can book it. If far away "wire it" at our expense and let funds follow by first mail. Orders mailed Friday, December 7, accepted. Six dollars and twenty-five cents buys five ups on 5,000 bushels for seven or fifteen days; \$12.50 buys five ups on 5,000 bushels for seven and fifteen days.

Very truly, yours,

J. K. COMSTOCK & CO.

Mr. MACON. You will observe from the reading of Mr. Avery's letter that these gamblers are anxious to catch the young men of the country, and, from the reading of the Comstock letter, that they want to catch them quick. They are not willing for them to wait to send in their orders by letter for fear they will have time to think and decide not to engage in the nefarious practice; consequently they are called upon to

"Wire it at our expense." Since introducing this bill I have received letters from each of the great subdivisions of the United States urging me to do all I could to have it passed at this session, but I will not take up the time of the House by having more of them read. I had the Avery and Comstock letters read for the purpose of showing that the people of the country are being filched of their hard earnings in every quarter of it by these speculators and the wily practices resorted to by the speculators to catch the innocent "nibbler." The Comstock letter represents that the concern deals in grain and provisions, and you would naturally suppose from the large letters on the letter head that they were legitimate dealers, but when you glance at the right-hand corner of the page you will find printed "Ups and downs a specialty," which would give the whole matter away to an experienced business man, but, as Mr. Avery says, these communications are nearly always sent to young men who are working on a salary, and they, being without experience, do not comprehend at a glance that they are dealing with speculating sharks, and hence are caught before they know it. Yes, sir, as Mr. Avery says, this concern sends out this character of letter to the young men of the country about twice a month, encouraging them to take stock in their hazardous business, and urging them to be quick about it, to write at once, and if far away to wire at their expense. Mr. Chairman, in order to catch an idea of the infamy of the business engaged in by Comstock & Co., it is only necessary to read the first part of their letter to Mr. Avery, which is as follows:

DEAR SIR: There is certainly going to be something "doing" in this wheat market, and it may be this coming week, and if you will only take a risk of \$6.25 or \$12.50 you stand an excellent chance of getting 5,000 or 10,000 bushels of wheat for this small amount of money.

Why, sir, any man of any sense at all ought to be able to see robbery stamped all over the face of that declaration. It means, simply, assuming wheat to be worth a dollar a bushel, that if one were to put up \$6.25 and get 5,000 bushels of wheat in return therefor that some one must necessarily be robbed of \$4,993.75 in order for him to get it.

Mr. Chairman, I can not conceive of a more reprehensible business than that of controlling the price of the products of the toiling masses of the country by speculative practices and at the same time debauching the young men of the country, teaching them the gambling habit, whereby they may rush in with their savings of a week or month, perhaps a year, and have them vanish on a simple turn of the speculative wheel instead of "a turn of the card."

Gentlemen, if the farmers who have been clamoring for this kind of legislation for years will only take the matter up in a plain, practical, business way with their Representatives in Congress, they will have this bill passed; but unless they unite upon the subject and organize and direct, nay, command, their Representatives here to vote for a measure of this character they will never get any relief from these "skin-game" speculators. They go on from bad to worse, enticing men of splendid character into this gambling practice, and in a sense debauching the morals of many of the best citizens of the community. How often is it in reading the press that you see where the cashier, or the assistant cashier, or the teller of this or that bank has become a defaulter in the sum of from \$10,000, perhaps, to \$500,000, all by reason of speculating in futures? Gentlemen, it is demoralizing to business in every way, and there is no one who can advocate it, from a moral or a business standpoint, except the speculator, who filches money from the pockets of the people who play at their game of hazard and ruin the farmer by controlling the price of the product of his toil. I want the farmers of this country to organize themselves and see to it that this or a measure similar to it is passed. I have no personal pride in passing this particular bill, and I am willing for it to pass under the name of any other member of this body. I simply want it passed, and I do not care whose name it bears. I want some measure passed that will give relief along the lines indicated by the measure. Sirs, a law prohibiting interstate transactions of this kind, supplemented by a legislative act preventing a citizen of a State from having similar transactions with citizens of the same State, would put an end to the whole business, and certainly the passage of this bill will stop these "luring" letters that are sent out by these gambling institutions twice a month, according to Mr. Avery, from going through the mails and enticing and inducing the young men of the country to "wire" their \$6.25 in, if they have not time to write, so that the transaction can be made without delay or without fail.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas yield?

Mr. MACON. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Does not the gentleman think there might

be some very proper and profitable legislation along the line of excluding from the mails letters of the character which the gentleman has had read?

Mr. MACON. This bill provides for that.

Mr. GARRETT. The bill provides that? I am not familiar with the bill.

Mr. MACON. Yes, sir; the bill provides that all matter, written or printed, which in any wise pertains to dealing in futures shall be excluded from the mail. There is nothing, in my judgment, that concerns the farmer so much just now as this very question. I believe it is of more importance to him than any other bill that is pending before Congress at this hour. I say that with a full knowledge of the fact that there are many important measures pending here that would be helpful to the farmers if enacted into law; but, sir, I believe this is above all with them, because it deals with a practice that controls the price of their products absolutely. They have nothing to say about it at all. It makes the price fictitious all the time. They do not know, gentlemen, where they are at at any stage of the proceeding. Sirs, as I have indicated, a bale of cotton, well rounded, weighing 500 pounds, worth \$50 to-day, ought to be worth \$50 to-morrow, and would be worth \$50 to-morrow but for this speculation in price, which, gentlemen, will run it down perhaps to where it is only worth \$40 to-morrow. When the little fellows take hold of the bait and begin to nibble, the prices begin to fluctuate at once, and it is only a question of a short time when they will be safely landed in the speculator's basket, where they can flounder to the crack of doom without hope of relief. That kind of dealing makes a fictitious price, gentlemen, and is unjust in every conceivable sense, and should not be tolerated by the representatives of the American people when they know that the foundation of every institution rests upon the farmer as its corner stone. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the reason this kind of legislation is ignored by Congress is because the farmer goes along in his everyday way, following the mule from daylight until dark, too busily engaged making an honest living to agitate questions, too busy to think whether he will wire his Representative about this or that species of legislation, too tired at night to write him a letter requesting him to interest himself in this or that kind of legislation, and hence he is neglected by his Congressman. But the stockbrokers in the city of New York, in Chicago, and in all of the other speculative centers are never tired; they are never too busy to look out for their interests. They, sir, have their eyes open for such legislation as this all the time, and they can and will use the wire or the mail or any other instrumentality that can be brought to bear in order to prevent legislation of this sort. But if the farmers will organize themselves as they should, they can have their day of legislation; if they resolve that, "by the Eternal," a measure of this kind shall be passed, that they shall have relief, sir, they can get it. All they will have to do will be to say to a candidate for Congress, "I will not vote for you for the nomination unless you pledge yourself to vote for a bill to prohibit dealing in futures." If he refuses to pledge himself, then they can nominate a candidate who will pledge himself to do it, and they can find some one in every community who will. Sirs, standing here as a Democrat, loving the principles of Democracy as I do, I want to say to you that if the farmers will consult their own interests they will not again vote for anyone for nomination or election to Congress who will not pledge himself to vote to kill the "future business." If that is party treason, make the most of it. The farmers must open their eyes to the facts as they are; they have got to wake up, and if they will do it they will accomplish something along legislative lines.

But, as I have said, they have been too busy, they have not had the time; but the time is coming when they will have it; and when they do wake up, when they do start, they will make just as good hands in the matter of controlling legislation as they made soldiers in the mighty conflict between the States of this Union; and no braver or better soldiers than they ever put foot upon a battlefield or rode a charger to his death. Therefore, gentlemen, I warn you now to give the matter some thought. Investigate, see for yourselves if you do not think that the farmers are being imposed upon by the speculators of this country; see if you think it is right that they shall make the farmers' cotton worth \$40 one day and \$50 the next, and vice versa; see whether you think the farmer or the speculator ought to control the price of the farmers' cotton, their corn, their meat, and wheat. The speculators are doing it now, three hundred and sixty-five days in the year. Will you, the people's representatives, allow them to continue to do so is the question that I submit to each and every one of you?

Mr. GARRETT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]?
Mr. MACON. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he can state approximately the effect that these "future" prices have on "spots?" I believe that the real thing is called "spots."

Mr. MACON. The "real thing" is called "spots."

Mr. GARRETT. Now, has the gentleman kept a sufficiently careful tab on prices during any given season to be able to state approximately how much the price of "futures" affects the price of "spots?"

Mr. MACON. I do not know, sir; nor do I know that anyone else does. I have a letter in my office which indicates that there is a difference of about a cent and a half between the "futures" and the "spots."

Mr. GARRETT. And does the price of the "spots" follow in fluctuation pretty much the price of the "futures?"

Mr. MACON. Yes, sir; it does absolutely. Each morning these bucket shops get telegraphic communications from their brokers, saying that middling cotton is worth so much that morning. They will immediately send runners all over the town to persons that they think would like to buy or sell at the opening figure, and it is not long before the "suckers" show up. The merchants have fallen into line with them in a large measure, and when the news comes to the broker he communicates with them by a phone, or otherwise, and they immediately adopt the speculator's price for their price. And so it has gone on and on until it has gotten to where the speculator controls the price of cotton, wheat, corn, and meat every hour of every day of every year from one end of this country to the other.

Mr. GARRETT. Can the gentleman state whether it is the practice of cotton dealers, I mean reputable cotton dealers, in the real article at the time of purchasing cotton to also purchase some cotton "futures" for the purpose of protecting themselves on the market? Is that the practice?

Mr. MACON. I believe when they buy "spots" they are forced to sell "futures" against the purchase on account of the spectacular fluctuation of the market furnished them by the speculators.

Mr. GARRETT. Is it not true that the effect of future dealing is to force legitimate cotton dealers into that practice?

Mr. MACON. There is no doubt about that. If you could do away with this "rapid-fire" speculation that could be avoided, but so long as prices change \$5 per bale in a few hours or in a day it will continue. We must do something to break up this practice that is plunging so many into crime and bankruptcy. These men are driven into the practice. It is hateful to them, and they would shout for joy to know that they were rid of it forever.

Mr. GARRETT. Now another question. Does the gentleman know a single instance in his observation where any individual in his section of the country has kept up this dealing in cotton futures for as much as three years, that that individual has not "gone broke," as they say, using a common expression?

Mr. MACON. I do not know of any.

Mr. GARRETT. They all eventually go to the wall.

Mr. MACON. In the very nature of things they will go to the wall if they keep it up.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MACON. Certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. You have alluded to bucket shops. Does your bill also cover cotton exchanges?

Mr. MACON. The bill covers everything that pertains to "dealing in futures." It seeks to prevent anybody from dealing in "futures" through an exchange, "bucket shop," or any other instrumentality of whatever name or character.

Mr. WALLACE. I thought that was your purpose, and therefore I asked the question.

Mr. GARRETT. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think it would be well to grant inquisitorial powers to the grand jury?

Mr. MACON. I think it would be well to require the district judge to make specific mention of the provision of the statute to the grand jury at every sitting of the court.

I have heard it said by gentlemen that it is necessary to have future transactions in order to establish markets, but that is not true. We have a tobacco market that is not established by "future" transactions. Tobacco stands on its own bottom. It is put in the hogshead and stored away in the warehouse, and buyers come and buy it according to the rule of supply and demand.

Mr. JAMES. I would state to the gentleman that tobacco is sold absolutely at the price fixed by the trust.

Mr. MACON. I suppose they can fix it; they usually do as they please, because we can not get the courts to prosecute them.

Mr. JAMES. Nobody is to be deceived by the idea that the price of tobacco is controlled by the law of supply and demand, because it is absolutely dictated by the trust; and in order to protect our part of the country from that, organizations have been made for the protection of the tobacco grower against the trust.

Mr. MACON. I am glad that is true. I think trusts ought to be organized against everywhere and prosecuted to the letter.

Mr. JAMES. The tobacco trust has monopolized the tobacco market absolutely, and denies the farmer the right to sell in an open market, but permits him only to sell in a monopolized market.

Mr. MACON. Well, of course, the trusts have things pretty much their own way, for the reason stated a moment ago. I was merely speaking of tobacco as an illustration. If its price was not controlled by the trust it would be established by the law of supply and demand, the very best market maker in the world. So would the price of cotton, meat, and grain be fixed by that God-given law but for "bucket shops."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am through with the subject for this time. I have had more to say than I thought when I took the floor, but, sir, my sincere desire to do something for the farmer, who has done so much, and who is still doing so much for mankind, has controlled me in what I have said, and is the only excuse I have to offer for having detained the House as long as I have. Judging by the small amount of legislation that has been enacted by Congress in behalf of the farmer, I am constrained to think that his cause has consumed but a bagatelle of the time of this body for the past forty years. Seemingly we have had legislation for everybody and everything but the farmer in that time, and it strikes me that it is high time for Representatives to interest themselves in his cause.

Therefore, gentlemen, I am going to ask you to give this measure careful consideration. Get a copy of the bill and read it, consult your constituents about it, and see whether or not, in your honest judgment, the condition of the agricultural toilers of this country would not be bettered if a measure of this character should become a part of the law of our land. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, the expenditures of the United States Government have reached an appalling figure, and they have become so voluminous and so complicated that it is a matter of impossibility for any individual Member here to vote intelligently upon any particular item. Take, for instance, a few items in the present bill, "two clerks of class 4, four clerks of class 3, six clerks of class 2, and twenty-five clerks of class 1, etc." What Member here is in position to know whether the number of clerks in the various classes is demanded by the actual necessities of the service, or whether the compensation defined in the bill is a just compensation? What member of the Appropriations Committee is able to give a satisfactory explanation of the necessity of the number of clerks in the different classes and the compensation provided?

The Manual of the House has provided certain committees whose duty it is to make a thorough investigation of the expenditures in each Department, and the particular rule providing for these committees reads as follows:

42. The examination of the accounts and expenditures of the several departments of the Government and the manner of keeping the same; the economy, justness, and correctness of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; the proper application of public moneys; the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; retrenchment; the enforcement of the payment of moneys due to the United States; the economy and accountability of public officers; the abolishment of useless offices; the reduction or increase of the pay of officers, shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction of the nine standing committees on the public expenditures in the several Departments, as follows:

43. In the Department of State: To the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.

And the enumeration continues until every Department is assigned to a committee of investigation.

Thus the rules provide committees the specific duty of which is to examine thoroughly every expenditure in every Department of the Government. And yet these committees never hold meetings, and I doubt whether 90 per cent of the members of these committees can tell you to-day where their committee room is located. And the chairmen of these committees are making use of the committee rooms. Whether they are using them for their own personal purposes or for public purposes other than those provided in the rule for these committees, I am not in position to say. But we have reached that amazing condition where the chairmen of these committees have monopolized the committee rooms, and Members themselves hardly feel at liberty

to enter them. And I dare say that the same situation obtains with reference to many other committees than these committees on expenditures.

I make the assertion in good faith that it is doubtful if 90 per cent of the members of these various committees on expenditures in the different Departments could locate the committee rooms if they were asked to do so to-day. [Laughter.] This statement is applicable to every one of these committees except the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department. The chairman of that committee, Mr. LITTLEFIELD, of Maine, during the last session of Congress introduced a bill authorizing his committee to send for witnesses and papers and to institute an investigation of the expenditures in the Agricultural Department in line with the spirit of the Manual. The committee to which it was referred reported it favorably. The House adopted it, and an investigation of the Agricultural Department began. The result we have yet to learn.

The chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor introduced a similar resolution; it was held up in the Committee on Rules, and no other chairman has made, so far as I know, any very great effort to revive these committees and give them the functions which they were originally designed to exercise under the intendment of the law.

I introduced myself bills reviving all of these committees except the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor and the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture. These bills were referred to the Committee on Rules, and there they sleep to-day. The Committee on Rules has taken no step to give these committees the control and the authority for investigation which they should possess by favorably reporting such bills. These are some of the reasons that the expenditures of the Government are passing beyond the management and even the comprehension of the House. We are not making the investigation which we should make under the rule. We have allowed the committees whose duty it is to conduct such investigation to become absolutely inactive.

It is an illustration of the utter helplessness into which the House has fallen under the domination of the Speaker and the Committee on Rules. Once the Government was in reality a Government of three departments, the executive, the judicial, and the legislative, but the inactivity of these committees is one of the greatest illustrations of the humiliating condition which we occupy to-day before the country, the Speaker regarded as the House and the Members of the House as mere automatons registering his will. It was once a government of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments, but the delectable triumvirate which now dominates the Republic is composed of Theodore Roosevelt, JOSEPH G. CANNON, and the eternal devil. [Laughter and applause.]

A MEMBER. • To what department of the Government does he belong? [Laughter.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. To all departments, under the present political dispensation; the invisible but most influential attendant at every Cabinet meeting.

Mr. WALLACE. Can the gentleman from Texas inform me whether the Committee on Improvement of the Levees of the Mississippi River has ever been revived?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you a member of that committee?

Mr. WALLACE. I was for two years, and there was never a called meeting of it, to the best of my recollection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did you know where the committee room was located?

Mr. WALLACE. I walked in front of the door once, but never darkened it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MACON. I will tell the gentleman that we brought that committee to life at the last session of Congress, and it recommended to the House and the House passed a bill from that committee.

Mr. WALLACE. I thank the gentleman for the information, and congratulate him and all who were interested in bringing it about.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will ask the gentleman in charge of the time on the other side [Mr. LIVINGSTON] if he has anyone else who desires to speak at the present time?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have no other demand from my side of the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is no demand from that side of the House for time, but I understand there will be to-morrow; and I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, before that motion is declared carried, I ask leave to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can do that in the House.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 21574, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

REPRINT OF LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, being informed that copies of the House bill now under consideration are exhausted, together with the report, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill and report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for a reprint of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill and the report thereon. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GORDON, IRONSIDES & FARES COMPANY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit a report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in regard to the application of the British embassy, in behalf of Messrs. Gordon, Ironsides & Fares Company, of Canada, for reimbursement in the sum of \$7,626.08, which they allege the United States customs authorities improperly exacted of them in November, 1902, as duties on certain sheep and cattle.

I renew the recommendation which I made to the Congress on January 12, 1904, that, in view of the facts shown in the correspondence, provision be made for the company's reimbursement.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

The message and accompanying documents were referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President:

To the Congress:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and to the provisions of section 2 of the joint resolution approved May 1, 1900, I transmit herewith five ordinances (enumerated in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State) enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico with the approval of the governor thereof.

The attention of Congress is invited to the statement of the Secretary of State that the transmission of these ordinances does not imply any request that they be printed.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

The SPEAKER. The message transmitting these ordinances contains the following:

The attention of Congress is invited to the statement of the Secretary of State that the transmission of these ordinances does not imply any request that they be printed.

Now, the Chair is under the impression that the fact of the reference will, under the rule, carry with it the printing of the ordinances. Apparently they are not very bulky, and if there is no motion to the contrary, the message and the accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and be printed.

BRITISH SCHOONER LILLIE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in the claim of the British schooner *Lillie*.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

ORDINANCES OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered printed.

To the Congress:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith nine ordinances (enumerated in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State) enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico with the approval of the governor thereof.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

EASTERN EXTENSION AUSTRALASIA AND CHINA TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the

accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on War Claims and ordered printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, with reference to the claim of the Eastern Extension Australasia and China Telegraph Company for compensation on account of expenses incurred in repairing its Manila-Hongkong and Manila-Capiz cables which were cut by the United States forces during the war with Spain.

I renew the recommendation made by President McKinley, that as an act of equity and comity provision be made by the Congress for reimbursement to the company of the actual expenses incurred by it in the repair of the cables.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

LIEUT. COL. L. K. SCOTT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, concerning the claim of Lieut. Col. L. K. Scott, a British subject, on account of the adoption by the Ordnance Department of the United States Army of a system of sighting of which he is the inventor.

In view of the recognition by the Chief of Ordnance of the Army of the equitable right of Lieutenant-Colonel Scott to payment for the use of his invention, I recommend that provision be made by Congress for the payment of this claim.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 10, 1906.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. BINGHAM (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, asking authority from Congress for Capt. Dorr F. Tozier, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, to accept a sword tendered him by the Lords Commissioners of the British Admiralty—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Secretary to rent buildings on sites purchased by the Government for public buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Astoria Harbor, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, submitting a detailed statement of claims of postmasters acted on during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, submitting his annual report—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting the report of Edwin W. Sims on the Alaskan fur-seal fisheries—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of increased appropriation for the post-office at Red Wing, Minn.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for survey, etc., of lands in Flathead Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Truckee-Carson irrigation project as related to the Paiute allotments—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Big and Little Fork rivers, Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Broadkill Creek, Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Ordnance, a statement of cost of manufacture of guns by the Government during the fiscal year ended

June 30, 1906—to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Susan Shatswell, executrix of estate of Nathaniel Shatswell, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William L. Ross against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Ernest C. North against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John H. Arey against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Benjamin S. Ford against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Joseph D. Wyatt against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William W. Wenner, executor of estate of Joseph Waltman, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John W. Harvey, jr., administrator of estate of Z. H. German, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of P. L. Williams, administrator de bonis non cum testamento annexo of estate of John S. Pendleton, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Minor Saunders against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Charles A. Rolfe, administrator of estate of Oscar A. Rolfe, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of T. M. Davidson, administrator of estate of Margaret Davidson, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Clarissa H. Tipton, administratrix of estate of Isaac Tipton, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of W. C. Gill, administrator de bonis non of estate of Edward O. Watkins, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William H. Boswell against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of A. P. Young, administrator of estate of John R. Pearson, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Henry Millingar against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the actions filed by the court in the cases of W. Delap and Hallam Eldredge against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, trans-

mitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Margaret A. Hickman against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John B. Eads against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Delaware Indians against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of Thomas Bowler and sundry others against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of W. J. McGowan and Samuel G. Holland's executor against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a list of certain cases dismissed by the court for want of prosecution—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of Joseph C. Hodges and sundry others against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Nora Walsh against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of Nelson O. Underwood and sundry others against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action of the court in the cases of Thomas Watkins and others against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the action filed by the court in the cases of Ann Worthington and sundry others against The United States, because of findings that claimants were not loyal—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Julia Zepp, administratrix of estate of Henry Zepp, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Septimus Brown against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Joseph H. Harrison and others, heirs of estate of Henry Harrison, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the decisions filed by the court in the cases of A. Jackson Jones and William Rutherford against The United States, dismissed for want of prosecution—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Solomon Foulk against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting papers relating to the claim of Arthur G. Fiske, postmaster at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Long Cove, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pen-

sions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3297) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lonergan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5329); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1673) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Edson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5330); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20623) granting an increase of pension to James B. O. Horbach, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5331); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20829) granting an increase of pension to David M. Watkins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5332); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2761) granting an increase of pension to Michael Mahoney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5333); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20844) granting an increase of pension to Milton Russell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5334); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20899) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Carpenter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5335); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20965) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Sine, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5336); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21054) granting an increase of pension to William G. Wilson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5337); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21228) granting an increase of pension to Pleasant Crissip, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5338); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12557) granting an increase of pension to John C. Berry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5339); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21304) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kohl, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5340); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18089) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Harte, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5341); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18454) granting an increase of pension to Barlow Davis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5342); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19044) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. McCormick, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5343); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19990) granting an increase of pension to Susan F. Christie, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5344); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19963) granting an increase of pension to Charles Alford Carter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5345); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19541) granting an increase of pension to Job F. Martin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5346); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20350) granting an increase of pension to Theodore F. Reighter, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5347); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20384) granting an increase of pension to Mary Wilson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5348); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14298) granting an increase of pension to John Remick, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5349); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14543) granting an increase of pension to Charles Barnell, alias Richard North, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5350); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15471) granting an increase of pension to Eli Stover, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5351); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16002) granting a pension to Theodore T. Bruce, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5352); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12554) granting an increase of pension to William Larraby, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5353); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16101) granting a pension to Alice Pugh, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5354); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18295) granting a pension to Joshua B. Casey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5355); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10751) granting an increase of pension to George W. Harris, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5356); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10760) granting a pension to Libbie Merrill, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5357); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10916) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Shreeves, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5358); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11701) granting a pension to Marion Waldorph, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5359); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12370) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Randolph, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5360); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R.

13455) granting an increase of pension to Josiah P. Higgins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5361); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4834) granting an increase of pension to Silas V. White, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5362); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6705) granting an increase of pension to William H. Zachary, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5363); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8312) granting an increase of pension to Abram Sours, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5364); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8915) granting an increase of pension to Susan Woolley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5365); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8668) granting an increase of pension to Stephen H. Rogers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5366); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21302) granting an increase of pension to Nicolaus Kirsch, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5367); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 21669) to provide for the incorporation of banks within the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21670) to regulate the production and sale of milk and cream in and for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 21671) to provide for the rapid defense of the Pacific coast ports—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 21672) to increase the weight of packages of fourth-class matter that may be conveyed by mail over local rural free-delivery routes and fixing the rate of postage thereon—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 21673) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States over the court of appeals of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 21674) to prohibit Senators and Representatives in Congress and Senators and Representatives elect from serving or receiving pay from public service corporations and other persons as officer, agent, representative, or attorney, and providing penalties therefor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 21675) to regulate the salaries of letter carriers in free-delivery offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 21676) authorizing readjustment of compensation to be paid for transportation of mails on railroad routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 21677) to amend an act granting to the Davenport Water Power Company rights to construct and maintain a canal, power station, and appurtenant works in the Mississippi River in Scott County, Iowa—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 21678) to provide for the extension of time within which homestead settlers may establish their residence upon certain lands which were heretofore a part of the Crow Indian Reservation, within the counties of Yellowstone and Rosebud, in the State of Montana—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21679) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Billings, Mont.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 21680) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Arkansas River between the mouth of the Poteau River and the mouth of the Grand River, near the city of Muscogee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 21681) to appropriate \$50,000, in addition to the sum now being expended, for demonstration farm work in the cotton-growing States afflicted with the Mexican cotton boll weevil—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 21682) to provide for an allowance for subsistence of rural free-delivery carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21683) to increase salaries of rural free-delivery carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 21684) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21685) for the extension of Nineteenth street NW. from Woodley road to Biltmore street, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 21686) to extend the privileges of the transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement to the city of Fort Worth, in the State of Texas—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21687) to further promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 21688) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Cleburne, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 21689) to increase the limit of cost of five light-house tenders heretofore authorized—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 21690) for the erection of a public building at Abbeville, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21691) to increase the compensation of carriers on rural free-delivery mail routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 21692) to amend the internal-revenue laws so as to provide for furnishing certified copies of certain records—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 21693) to provide for the purchase of a suitable site and the erection of a public building for the United States post-office at Hillsboro, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 21694) for the erection of a public building at Newberry, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 196) relating to the construction of a bridge at Fort Snelling, Minn.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOWDEN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 197) proposing an amendment to the Constitution fixing the term of the President and Vice-President at six years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 198) requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate and report on car shortage of interstate carriers—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 45) concerning the adjournment of Congress for the holiday recess—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: A resolution (H. Res. 651) directing the Postmaster-General to report to the House certain information concerning clerks and carriers in the Chicago post-office—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MILLER: A resolution (H. Res. 652) requesting the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to investigate the causes of the high prices of lumber in the various stages of manufacture—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A resolution (H. Res. 653) for the appointment of a stenographer to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 21695) granting an increase of pension to James A. Maxwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21696) granting a pension to Oliver C. C. Pollock, alias John E. Douglass—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21697) granting an increase of pension to Clark Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21698) granting an increase of pension to George W. Sherman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21699) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21700) granting an increase of pension to Eli Hovis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21701) for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine Volunteers—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BANNON: A bill (H. R. 21702) granting an increase of pension to John Cyrus Rinehart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 21703) granting an increase of pension to Carl F. Reickert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21704) granting an increase of pension to George Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21705) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Hammer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21706) granting a pension to W. M. Atkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21707) granting an honorable discharge to Robert D. Keffer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21708) granting an honorable discharge to Haden Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21709) granting a pension to Susan Hensley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 21710) granting an increase of pension to Truman Covert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21711) granting an increase of pension to Thor Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21712) granting an increase of pension to George C. Howland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21713) granting an increase of pension to William Orr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21714) granting an increase of pension to William A. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21715) granting an increase of pension to Wesley McCarty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21716) granting an increase of pension to John Sine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21717) granting an increase of pension to John M. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21718) granting an increase of pension to Franz Z. F. W. Jensen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 21719) granting a pension to Winnie Turner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 21720) granting a pension to Clark R. Parcel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21721) granting a pension to John R. Kissinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 21722) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21723) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21724) granting an increase of pension to John D. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21725) granting an increase of pension to John S. McNair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21726) granting an increase of pension to Victory T. Trail—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21727) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Benson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 21728) granting a pension to James W. Beville—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21729) to authorize the President of the United States, with the consent of the Senate, to place James M. Alden on the retired list of the Navy with the rank and retired pay of a lieutenant—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 21730) granting an increase of pension to Levi S. Raff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21731) granting an increase of pension to Anna R. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21732) granting an increase of pension to John Gumpert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 21733) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Matley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 21734) granting an increase

of pension to Stephen B. H. Shanks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21735) granting an increase of pension to Walter W. Brunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21736) granting an increase of pension to Philip H. Albright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21737) granting an increase of pension to William C. George—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21738) granting an increase of pension to Harrison P. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21739) granting an increase of pension to John Rittenhouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 21740) granting an increase of pension to Maria R. Klindt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 21741) for the relief of William J. Briggs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 21742) granting a pension to Mary J. Kerens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 21743) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 21744) for the relief of the estate of John Hoey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 21745) for the relief of Maj. George A. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENBY: A bill (H. R. 21746) granting an increase of pension to William N. Carlisle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21747) granting an increase of pension to Bell R. Finleyson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21748) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21749) granting an increase of pension to Annie Reaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21750) granting a pension to the minor children of William Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 21751) granting an increase of pension to William D. Wolford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21752) granting an increase of pension to James Dees—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21753) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21754) granting an increase of pension to William Perry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21755) granting an increase of pension to Monroe Godby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21756) granting an increase of pension to William T. Belk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21757) granting a pension to Newton Gambrel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21758) granting an honorable discharge to Amasa Hodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 21759) granting an increase of pension to Jacob D. Perkins, alias Jacob Perkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 21760) granting a pension to Morgan Van Gorder—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 21761) granting an increase of pension to John Tims—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 21762) granting an increase of pension to Darwin A. Brink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21763) granting an increase of pension to S. J. Sargent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A bill (H. R. 21764) granting an increase of pension to Ment Stannah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 21765) granting an increase of pension to Ida E. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21766) granting a pension to Louisa M. Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 21767) granting an increase of pension to George Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 21768) granting a pension to Eliza Bracelin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21769) granting a pension to Emma Aiken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21770) granting a pension to Mary A. Alliger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21771) granting an increase of pension to George W. Amick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21772) removing the charge of desertion from the record of Benjamin F. Hurley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 21773) for the relief of R. K. Forrest, administrator of J. W. Forrest, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 21774) granting a pension to Samuel Meade Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 21775) for the relief of F. M. Wadley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21776) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Tobey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 21777) granting a pension to Mary D. Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21778) granting a pension to Lucy F. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 21779) granting an increase of pension to James Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 21780) granting an increase of pension to Luman Van Hoosen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21781) granting an increase of pension to J. P. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 21782) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 21783) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Ricklesen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 21784) granting an increase of pension to William Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21785) granting a pension to Sarah A. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 21786) granting a pension to Thomas Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21787) granting a pension to Alexander Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21788) granting a pension to Satina A. Waymer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 21789) granting an increase of pension to Marion W. Brosier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 21790) for the relief of Hyter Myers—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 21791) granting a pension to Icybinda Spalding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 21792) granting a pension to Frank H. Loud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 21793) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLEPPER: A bill (H. R. 21794) granting an increase of pension to Centennial W. Shreckengast—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21795) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Church—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 21796) granting a pension to Richard Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 21797) granting an increase of pension to Edgar F. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21798) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 21799) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Rickrode—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21800) granting an increase of pension to Louis N. Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21801) granting an increase of pension to John Roth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21802) granting a pension to Charles P. Kibler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21803) granting a pension to Anna R. Slothower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21804) granting a pension to Ella K. Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 21805) grant-

ing an increase of pension to Ira Shafer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21806) granting an increase of pension to Michael L. Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21807) granting an increase of pension to James T. Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 21808) granting an increase of pension to Levi Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21809) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. McStraw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21810) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Dornsife—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21811) granting an increase of pension to Melvin W. Diver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21812) granting an increase of pension to Stephen F. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21813) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kelmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 21814) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe P. Soper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21815) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 21816) granting an increase of pension to Louisa E. Holt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 21817) granting a pension to Jennie E. Keown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21818) granting an increase of pension to William Hardesty—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 21819) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Peach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOWDEN: A bill (H. R. 21820) for the relief of Martin H. Avey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21821) for the relief of William Vincent—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21822) granting a pension to John B. Laillet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21823) granting a pension to Myron T. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21824) granting a pension to Martha E. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21825) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Nicholls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21826) granting an increase of pension to John Mehafeff—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21827) granting an increase of pension to Francis Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21828) granting an increase of pension to Noah Perrin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21829) to amend the military record of Joseph H. Gible—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21830) to amend the military record of Joseph S. Hurst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 21831) granting an increase of pension to Anson B. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21832) granting an increase of pension to John W. Wilkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21833) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21834) granting a pension to Nancy J. Goodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21835) granting an increase of pension to Allen L. Bevan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 21836) granting a pension to Mary C. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 21837) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kasson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 21838) granting an increase of pension to Fannie J. Terry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 21839) granting an increase of pension to Marian A. Mulligan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 21840) granting an increase of pension to Charles Tribolin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 21841) for the relief of H. C. Linn and Samuel Powell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 21842) granting

an increase of pension to Danford Redding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21843) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Delaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21844) for the relief of Hansell Hatfield, of McMinn County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21845) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Hemphill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 21846) granting a pension to Mayer Frankel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21847) granting a pension to John Baringer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 21848) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Arthur—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 21849) granting an increase of pension to John P. Dix—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21850) granting an increase of pension to James Orlando Cummings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21851) granting a pension to Joseph W. Little—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 21852) granting an increase of pension to James M. Eaman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21853) granting an increase of pension to William A. Whitaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21854) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Irwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21855) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 21856) granting an increase of pension to John G. Viall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 21857) to correct the military record of Jacob Rockwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21858) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William H. Reynolds—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 21859) granting an increase of pension to Simon Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 21860) granting an increase of pension to William F. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21861) granting an increase of pension to William Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21862) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21863) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Stowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21864) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 21865) for the relief of John B. Page, first lieutenant Company K, Fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 21866) granting an increase of pension to Richard H. Atkinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 21867) for the relief of Charles L. Blanton—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCROGGY: A bill (H. R. 21868) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Tiebe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21869) granting an increase of pension to Mary G. Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21870) granting an increase of pension to John A. Mayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21871) granting an increase of pension to H. B. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21872) granting a pension to Samuel J. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21873) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 21874) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Chisam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 21875) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21876) granting a pension to Jane Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21877) granting a pension to Cinderella Walton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21878) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21879) granting an increase of pension to Even Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21880) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Noel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 21881) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21882) granting an increase of pension to Frank Breazeale—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21883) granting an increase of pension to George W. Saunders—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 21884) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21885) granting a pension to Sylvania S. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 21886) granting an increase of pension to John Bryant—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21887) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hayman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21888) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Canova—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 21889) granting a pension to Albert V. Sieren—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21890) granting an increase of pension to Lewis D. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21891) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Sinclair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21892) granting an increase of pension to James F. Westenberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21893) granting an increase of pension to George Albright—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 21894) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21895) granting an increase of pension to John Satory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 21896) granting an increase of pension to George H. Field—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 21897) granting a pension to C. F. Schantz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21898) granting a pension to Joseph Cornelius—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21899) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Koch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21900) granting an increase of pension to Hellen O. Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21901) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21902) granting an increase of pension to Sybil Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21903) granting an increase of pension to Celia Congdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21904) granting an increase of pension to Margaretha Esswein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21905) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Everly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21906) granting an increase of pension to John M. Bruder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21907) granting an increase of pension to William Lange—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21908) granting an increase of pension to Edward Dullea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21909) granting an increase of pension to George W. W. Tanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21910) granting a pension to Emil S. Weisse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21911) granting an increase of pension to George Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21912) granting an increase of pension to William H. Chapin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21913) granting an increase of pension to Henry Pieper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21914) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Pahl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21915) granting an increase of pension to John A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21916) granting an increase of pension to John W. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21917) granting an increase of pension to William D. Hambricht—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21918) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21919) granting an increase of pension to Orland F. Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21920) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Jillson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21921) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Hyde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21922) granting an increase of pension to Hugo Arndt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21923) granting an increase of pension to Sebastian Fuchs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21924) granting an increase of pension to Donald McMillan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21925) granting a pension to Catherine Brill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3224) granting a pension to Catherine Eberlein—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21450) granting a pension to Will. P. Hall—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21528) granting a pension to Martha A. Wright—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21529) granting a pension to Charlotte Game—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21530) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Bonner—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21531) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Macy—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edward W. Ferry and 1,575 other veteran soldiers in the Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, against removal of the canteen from the Homes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of a mass meeting of the colored citizens of Danville, Ill., under directions of the Constitutional League, relative to the discharge of colored soldiers of Companies B, C, and D of the Twenty-fifth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Continental Legion, of Danville, Ill., regarding the discharged colored soldiers of the Twenty-fifth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, for an appropriation of not less than \$50,000,000 annually for improvement of rivers and harbors and waterways—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Division No. 78 of the Order of Railway Conductors and other labor organizations, for the Merchant Marine Commission shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, for legislation relative to the law of libel (H. R. 11027, by Mr. GOEBEL)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACHESON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Stephen C. Allbright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: Petition of 283 citizens of Portsmouth and Newcastle, N. H., and Kittery, Me., for an appropriation to dredge Peppereles Cove, in Portsmouth Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ANDREWS: Petition of Hansen J. Schwartz and 282 other residents of Roswell, N. Mex., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDRUS: Petition of the Yonkers Federation of La-

bor, praying enactment of an eight-hour law so framed as to be applicable to work on battle ships, etc.—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Calvin E. Morley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BANNON: Petition of McDermott Council, No. 266, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, favoring an increase in the efficiency of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Patriotic Council, No. 47, Daughters of Liberty; Smoky City Council, No. 119; Lescalette Council, No. 442, and Purity Council, No. 554, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alexander Hanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, favoring the Mann patent bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petition of Ben Franklin Council, No. 10, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of Olympia Council, of Middletown, N. Y., and Delaware Council, of Port Jervis, N. Y., Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, for Appalachian and White mountains forest reservations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Abe Lincoln Council, No. 64, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of North Sedgwick, Me., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Nannie S. Berry, heir of Henry Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CASSEL: Resolutions of Akron Council, No. 906, of Akron, Pa., and Empire Council, No. 120, of Lancaster, Pa., Junior Order United American Mechanics, in favor of the passage of bill S. 4403, for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of A. B. Lowry, against the feature of the copyright bill detrimental to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of J. A. Turner, jr., of Tampa, Fla., against the feature of the copyright law detrimental to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of the City of Key West, Fla., for an increase of the artillery corps of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Federation of Women's Clubs of Florida, for repeal of the duty on works of art—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, for increase of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Musical Copyright League, against the feature of the copyright bill detrimental to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, for bill S. 6291, the Merchant Marine Commission bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CROMER: Petitions of Dunkirk Council, No. 14; Boundary Council, No. 59, and Delaware Council, No. 4, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of General McClellan Council, No. 150; Eureka Council, No. 38, and Star of the West Council, No. 465, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: Paper to accompany bill for

relief of the estate of John Hoey—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of Armory Lodge, No. 429, International Association of Machinists, of Rock Island, Ill., for the shipping bill (subsidy)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Will P. Hall (previously referred to Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Amasa Hodge and Newton Gambrel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Dies—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition for the repeal of bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOYD: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 21385, relative to improvements on the White River, in States of Missouri and Arkansas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of S. H. Britts and A. H. Alfrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ment Stannah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of New Era Council, No. 229; Winton Council, No. 283, and Price Hill Council, No. 210, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. E. Yoell, for inquiry by Congress into the methods and motives of Panama Canal Commission relative to the employment of Chinese labor on the canal—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of Vine Cliff Council, No. 83, Daughters of Liberty, and Decatur Council, No. 613, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Troy Hill Council, No. 319, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Fruit Growers' Association, for legislation to further the admission of American fruit to German markets under minimum duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hildale Council, No. 235, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of J. H. Harrison and 1,150 business men of Pittsburg, Pa., for bill H. R. 9754, relative to improvement in the classification of the clerical force in post-offices and for an increase of salaries, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association, favoring an increase of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of Washington Council, No. 2, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of the librarian of Brown University and of Redwood Library, of Newport, R. I., against section 30 of the bill H. R. 19853 and of the bill S. 6330, against restriction of importation of English books—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of R. K. Forrest, administrator of estate of J. W. Forrest—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel Meade Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of H. L. Reynolds and 75 others, of Connecticut, for an appropriation to remove obstructions in Eightmile River, Connecticut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of A. H. Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John F. Yeargin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Thomas Kay & Son, against that feature of the copyright law detrimental to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petitions of Goddess of Liberty Council, No. 155; Pride of Mechanics' Home Council, No. 61, of Jamesburg, N. J., and Golden Rod Council, No. 20, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Paper of Major Jenkins Post, No. 99, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hanover, Pa., to accompany bill for relief of Henry Hamme—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Peach Bottom Council, No. 715, and Cordorus Council, No. 115, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Dallaston Council, No. 105, Daughters of Liberty; Iowa Council, No. 26, Daughters of America; Aurora Council, No. 304, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Betsey Ross Council, No. 119, Daughters of Liberty, and Moss Ross Council, No. 292, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAMB: Petition of William McKinley Council, No. 182, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of George Upington, for bill S. 6339, relative to a general revision of the copyright laws—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of citizens of New York, against the tariff on art works—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Fisher Grange, No. 790, against the free distribution of seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petitions of Rescue Council, of Camden, N. J.; Diamond Council, and Thomas Jefferson Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and Pride of Bridgeport Council, Daughters of Liberty, for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCALL: Petitions of citizens of Somerville, Mass., and the Woman's Education Association of Boston, against the tariff on art works (bill H. R. 15268)—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of G. N. Hawley, against that feature in the copyright law inimical to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Rock Island Business Men's Association, for the improvement of the Mississippi River in the interest of transportation—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James W. Kasson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Petitions of Waynesboro Council, No. 760, Junior Order United American Mechanics; James A. Garfield Council, No. 129, Daughters of Liberty, and Lewisburg Council, No. 52, Daughters of America, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MANN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles Tribolen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Nipper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Robert H. Delaney, Thomas R. Elliott, James P. Shaw, Danford Redding, Hansel Hatfield, J. H. Allison, and T. R. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George H. Layman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of Pride of Alleghany Council, No. 28, and Golden Rule Council, No. 31, Daughters of Liberty; Resolute Council, No. 5, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Jennings Rens Council, No. 15, Daughters of America; Progressive Council, No. 83; Mountain City Council, No. 11; Valley Council, No. 26, and Myersville Council, No. 125, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Michael Isanogle and heirs of Upton Worthington—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POLLARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James M. Eaman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUJO: Paper to accompany bill for relief of J. Martin Compton, heir of John Compton, and the heirs of Harvey N. Parham—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles G. Perrin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Warren A. Woodson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of the Central Labor Union of Shamokin, Pa., favoring the shipping bill (Senate subsidy bill)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Petition of citizens of Missouri, praying for legislation for the protection of fruit growers against dishonest commission firms—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of R. T. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George W. Saunders—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Frank Breazeale—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petition of the librarian of the Toledo public library, against abridgement of the existing rights of libraries to import English books—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of S. B. May, against the feature of the copyright law inimical to mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Future Great Council, No. 290, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of the Commercial Club of St. Paul, Minn., for the Steenerson drainage bill (H. R. 10502; January 5, 1906)—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary J. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Paperhangers, Decorators, and Painters' Local Union No. 766, of Bloomington, Ill., for the subsidy shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the One hundred and thirteenth Illinois Veteran Volunteer Infantry Association, favoring an increase of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Emma S. Hunter, J. E. Waldon, and Andrew Sayles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William A. Whitaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN WINKLE: Petition of Victory Council, No. 93, Daughters of Liberty, of Jersey City, N. J., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petitions of Palestine Council, No. 30; Burning Springs Council, No. 17; Parkersburg (W. Va.) Council, No. 13, and Young America Council, No. 201, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOOD: Petitions of Pride of Trenton Council, No. 4, and Capital City Council, No. 20, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 11, 1906.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CULLOM, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

SENATOR FROM UTAH.

Mr. DUBOIS. I desire to state that on Thursday next, the 13th instant, immediately after the morning business, I shall call up for consideration Report No. 4253 and the resolution "That REED SMOOT is not entitled to a seat in the Senate as a Senator from the State of Utah," and submit some remarks thereon.

STATE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS.

Mr. RAYNER. I wish to state that to-morrow, at the conclusion of the morning business, I shall briefly address the Senate on the resolution in connection with the public schools of California and Japanese pupils.

POPULAR EDITION OF RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Public Printer, transmitting a report of an examination into the cost of labor and material required, etc., with respect to printing, at a reduced price, a special edition of the